DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 321 932 RC 017 635

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Adelman, Nancy E.; Cleland, Christene P. |
| TITLE | Descriptive Study of the Migrant Education Section 143 Interstate and Intrastate Coordination Program. |
| INSTITUTION | Policy Studies Associates, Inc., Washington, DC. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Department of Education, Washington, DC. Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation. |
| PUB DATE | Mar 87 |
| CONTRACT | 300-85-0103 |
| NOTE | 155p. |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC07 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Educational Assessment; Educational Needs; Elementary Secondary Education; *Federal Aid; *Grants; Information Dissemination; *Interstate Programs; *Migrant Education; Program Effectiveness; State Federal Aid; State Programs |
| IDENTIFIERS | *Interstate Cooperation; *Migrant Education Program |

ABSTRACT

This study describes and analyzes the Section 143 Migrant Education Interstate and Intrastate Coordination discretionary grants program from 1981-86. The program's funding mechanism changed fully from grants to contracts in fiscal year 1987. The study was designed to address the following broad research topics: (1) determination of inter- and intrastate coordination needs; (2) continuing inter- and intrastate coordination needs; (3) funding data and patterns; (4) the role of "cooperating states"; (5) types of projects funded; (6) the nature and utility of project outcomes; and (7) dissemination strategies. Twenty-one states were awarded a total of $13,849,206 in Section 143 grants between 1981-86. The study found a need for improved coordination among states and their local personnel in such areas as student credit transfer. Improved secondary school services and dropout prevention were also needed. New York and Pennsylvania together received 47% of the funding and 45% of the total awards. Most grants involved one or more states in a cooperative program. Only West Virginia had never participated as a cooperating state. Types of projects funded included career education, special education, resource centers, staff development, and health. A third of all projects focused on secondary school services. Principal activities conducted by the projects were technical assistance, curriculum development, and training. Most projects produced information, experiences, or other products that could be shared. There was, however, no central repository for products associated with the grants program. Local education agencies exhibited little awareness of Section 143 projects, except those with which their state agencies were heavily involved. (TES)

ED321932

# DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE MIGRANT EDUCATION SECTION 143 INTERSTATE AND INTRASTATE COORDINATION PROGRAM

Nancy E. Adelman
Christene P. Cleland

March 1987

Policy Studies Associates, Inc.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

RC 017635

This report is made pursuant to contract number 300-85-0103. The amount charged to the Department of Education for the work resulting in this report (inclusive of the amounts so charged for any prior reports submitted under this contract) is $39,649. The names of the persons with managerial or professional responsibility for the report are Nancy E. Adelman, Project Director and Elizabeth R. Reisner, DASC Director. The conclusions of the report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Department of Education or any other agency of the government.

POLICY STUDIES ASSOCIATES, INC.
1718 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N. W. • SUITE 700 • WASHINGTON, D. C. 20009 • (202) 939-9780

# DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE MIGRANT EDUCATION SECTION 143 INTERSTATE AND INTRASTATE COORDINATION PROGRAM

Nancy E. Adelman
Christene P. Cleland

March 1987

Data Analysis Support Center
Contract No. ED 300-85-0103

Prepared for

U.S. Department of Education
Planning and Evaluation Service
State and Local Grants Division

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## Purposes and Methods of the Study

This study describes and analyzes the Section 143 Migrant Education Interstate and Intrastate Coordination discretionary grants program during the period 1981-86. The funding of the program changed fully from grants to contracts in FY 1987.

The study was designed to address seven broad research areas:

- o determination of inter/intrastate coordination needs;
- o continuing inter/intrastate coordination needs;
- o funding data and patterns;
- o the role of "cooperating states";
- o types of projects funded;
- o the nature and utility of project outcomes;
- o dissemination strategies.

Research methods included the gathering of background information from multiple sources and supplemental telephone interviews with 21 state directors of migrant education, 34 directors of Section 143 projects, and personnel in 20 local educational agencies.

## Study Findings

The major findings of the study pertain to (1) needs assessment; (2) funding patterns; (3) the role of cooperating states; (4) the types of projects funded; and (5) project outcomes and dissemination.

### Needs Assessment

- o Adequate formal and informal procedures for determining current needs in migrant education are in place. However, state and local personnel do not clearly differentiate between the general educational needs of migrant students and the subset of those needs, such as secondary school credit transfer, that can best be addressed through inter/intrastate coordination. Strictly speaking, many Section 143 projects have not had a coordination focus.

- According to the state directors of migrant education, the most pressing needs in migrant education continue to be dropout prevention and improvement of secondary school services.

Funding Patterns

- During the period 1981-86, the Section 143 program made 108 awards to 53 discrete projects. Awards totalled $13,849,206.

- Twenty-one states have been grantees. Together, New York and Pennsylvania have received 47 percent of the funding and 45 percent of total awards. These two states are perceived to have more time and resources for grant activities than other states. Projects that they have administered receive generally high marks from the state directors interviewed.

Role of Cooperating States

- Most grants involve one or more other states in a "cooperating" status. The responsibilities associated with being a cooperating state range from pro forma involvement to development of one or more of the planned products of a grant.

- Only West Virginia has never participated as a cooperating state. Texas, on the other hand, has participated 50 times and Florida 44 times. The mean for all states is 14.

Types of Projects Funded

- Most projects fall into eight broad topic areas:

| | |
|---|---|
| Career education | 12 |
| Networks/resource centers | 10 |
| Evaluation models/pilot studies | 6 |
| Secondary services/dropout prevention | 6 |
| Special education | 4 |
| Staff development | 4 |
| Health | 3 |

- The majority of projects do not have an inter/intrastate coordination focus.

- Examples of projects that clearly have an inter/intrastate coordination focus include New York's Interstate Migrant Secondary Services Project (now being replicated by California's Western Secondary Team Project) and

Louisiana's Migrant Education National Dissemination and Information Center.

- o A third of all projects focus on secondary school services.

- o Principal activities conducted by projects include training, technical assistance, and curriculum development.

Project Outcomes and Dissemination

- o Most projects result in information, products, or experiences that can be shared. These are widely disseminated to the state level.

- o LEAs exhibit little awareness of Section 143 projects except with regard to activities in which their SEAs are heavily involved.

- o There is no central repository, either at ED or elsewhere, for products associated with the Section 143 grants program.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to acknowledge and thank the many individuals whose knowledge about and insights on interstate coordination in migrant education were invaluable in conducting this study. James English, the Education Department's Project Officer for the project, provided support and review throughout the study. In addition, staff in ED's Migrant Education Program office were unfailingly helpful. We would particularly like to thank William Stormer and Dusty Wilson for their comments and suggestions on draft materials.

Interviews with state directors of migrant education, project directors of Section 143 inter/intrastate coordination projects, and local migrant educators were critical to the completion of the study. While we cannot acknowledge them individually here, we wish to thank all those who responded to our telephone calls and shared their experiences with us. We are also grateful to Jerry Ortega, President of the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education, for sharing with us NASMDE's thinking on current and future priorities in migrant education.

In addition to the authors, the study team included John Morris of Policy Studies Associates. Elizabeth Reisner and Ellen Marks, also of Policy Studies Associates, provided invaluable substantive and editorial advice. Production was in the capable hands of Linda Bailey. To all of them, thank you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| EXECUTIVE SUMMARY | | i |
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS | | iv |
| I. | INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| | Purposes of the Study | 2 |
| | Overview of the Study Design and Research Methods | 3 |
| II. | BACKGROUND ON INTERSTATE AND INTRASTATE COORDINATION IN MIGRANT EDUCATION | 7 |
| | The Statutory and Regulatory History of Interstate and Intrastate Coordination in Migrant Education | 7 |
| | The Need for Inter/Intrastate Coordination in Migrant Education | 15 |
| III. | PROFILE OF THE SECTION 143 INTERSTATE AND INTRASTATE COORDINATION PROGRAM | 21 |
| | Funding Profile of Section 143 Grants, FYs 1981-86 | 21 |
| | Profile of Grantees | 24 |
| | Profile of Project Level Funding | 26 |
| IV. | DESCRIPTION OF INTERSTATE AND INTRASTATE COORDINATION PROJECTS, FYs 1981-86 | 35 |
| | Project Sites | 35 |
| | Staffing Structure | 36 |
| | Target Audiences | 37 |
| | Project Categories | 37 |

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)


Relationship of Continuation Grant to Original Grant..... 39

Project Activities..... 39

V. PROJECT OUTCOMES..... 45

Products..... 45

Projects with No Products..... 49

Dissemination..... 50

Indicators of Product and Dissemination Effectiveness..... 53

VI. CONCLUSIONS..... 57

Definition of Inter/intrastate Coordination Needs..... 57

Relationship of Identified Migrant Education Needs to Section 143 Project Outcomes..... 61

Dissemination of Outcomes..... 62

Locally Based Efforts at Interstate Coordination..... 63

BIBLIOGRAPHY..... 65

APPENDIX A Outline of Topics Covered in Telephone Interviews..... A-1

APPENDIX B Product and Dissemination Profiles of 34 Section 143 Interstate and Intrastate Coordination Projects..... B-1

APPENDIX C Overviews of 19 Section 143 Interstate and Intrastate Coordination Projects..... C-1

LIST OF TABLES


| Table | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| I-1 | Sample of States Contacted | 4 |
| I-2 | Number of Telephone Interviews Attempted and Completed | 4 |
| III-1 | Section 143 Funding Profile FYs 1981-86 | 22 |
| III-2 | Ratio of Applications to Awards Section 143 Program FYs 1981-86 | 23 |
| III-3 | Section 143 Grant Recipients FYs 1981-86 | 25 |
| III-4 | Migrant Stream Pattern in Grants Awarded FYs 1981-86 | 26 |
| III-5 | Funding History of Migrant Inter- and Intrastate Coordination Projects FYs 1981-86 | 28 |
| III-6 | New and Continuation Grants FYs 1981-86 | 27 |
| III-7 | Section 143 Cooperating State Status FYs 1981-86 | 30 |
| IV-1 | Project Sites for Section 143 Grants | 36 |
| IV-2 | Categories of Section 143 Funded Projects FYs 1981-86 | 38 |
| IV-3 | Principal Activities of Section 143 Projects, FYs 1981-86 | 40 |
| V-1 | Types of Products Developed by Section 143 Inter/Intrastate Coordination Projects FYS 1981-85 | 46 |
| V-2 | Section 143 Projects and Products Named by State Directors of Migrant Education | 54 |
| V-3 | Section 143 Projects Most Frequently Named by a Sample of LEAs | 55 |

# I. INTRODUCTION

The Migrant Education Interstate and Intrastate Coordination Program was first authorized in 1978 under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and continued under Chapter 1 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA). Most commonly referred to as the Section 143 program, it provides financial assistance to improve the inter/intrastate coordination activities required of state and local migrant education programs funded under Chapter 1, as amended. State educational agencies (SEAs) are the only eligible recipients of Section 143 grants. However, grantees may engage subgrantees such as universities or local educational agencies (LEAs) to carry out project activities. Furthermore, most grants involve one or more other states in a cooperating relationship. In some instances, migrant education staff in cooperating states carry out some of the activities described in the application.

From 1981 to 1986, the inter/intrastate coordination program operated as a small discretionary grants program. In FY 1987, the program plans to shift its funding vehicle to contracts. Section 143 also contains the statutory language that originally established and now maintains the Migrant Student Record Transfer System (MSRTS) on a contractual basis. Funding for both MSRTS and the coordination grants/contracts is reserved from total annual appropriations for the migrant education program.

This report is the first and only descriptive analysis of the Section 143 Migrant Education Interstate and Intrastate Coordination discretionary grants program. Its central focus is on the operations

and outcomes of the program during a six year period (1981-86). In that time, the U.S. Department of Education (ED) awarded 108 grants totalling $13,849,206.

Purposes of the Study

This descriptive analysis of the migrant education inter/intrastate coordination program is actually a retrospective examination of its accomplishments as a discretionary grants program. It is expected that the 1987 change from grants to contracts will significantly alter Section 143 procedures and activities, although the overall goals of the program will remain the same.

The study is structured around seven broad research questions posed by ED's Planning and Evaluation Service:

- How are inter/intrastate coordination needs in migrant education determined?
- What are the continuing needs for inter/intrastate coordination?
- What types of projects have been funded over a five year period?
- Given the structure of the program, what funding patterns have emerged over this period?
- What does it mean to be a "cooperating state" on a Section 143 project?
- What products or models have Section 143 projects developed during the period? Are they considered useful?
- What dissemination strategies have projects employed?

In addition to exploring these questions, the study examines the legislative and regulatory history of the program to determine congressional intent and Executive Branch goals for improving inter/intrastate coordination in the education of migrant children.

## Overview of the Study Design and Research Methods

The research questions posed by the Education Department required us to gather information and opinions from multiple sources. We obtained background information from reports of legislative hearings, conferences, and statutes, from proposed and final rules for the Section 143 program published in the Federal Register, from the results of an ERIC search, and from interviews with federal Migrant Education Program staff. In addition, we reviewed project files for grants awarded in FY 1985 and examined all grant products currently on file at ED.

To supplement this background information, we conducted unstructured telephone interviews with a sample of state directors of migrant education, personnel in LEAs serving migrant children, and directors of Section 143 projects. Table I-1 presents the states for which we collected supplemental data. The total sample of 23 states includes:

- all 10 states funded in FY 1985
- eight states funded in FY 1985 and in one or more previous years
- five states that were former grantees but participated only in a cooperating status in FY 1985
- three states that have never been grantees but frequently participate as cooperating states
- three states that did not actively participate in the Section 143 program at all in FY 1985

Table I-2 indicates the number of telephone interviews attempted and completed for each category of interviewee.

Table I-1

Sample of States Contacted

| States | Grantee FY 1985 | Grantee FYs 1981-84 | Cooperating State 1985 (No. of Projects) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Arkansas | X | X | 7 |
| California | X | X | 9 |
| Dist. of Columbia | | X | 0 |
| Florida | X | | 12 |
| Georgia | | X | 2 |
| Illinois | | | 9 |
| Indiana | X | X | 8 |
| Kansas | X | | 3 |
| Maryland | | X | 8 |
| Massachusetts | | | 7 |
| Michigan | | X | 6 |
| Minnesota | X | X | 10 |
| Mississippi | X | X | 1 |
| New Jersey | | X | 5 |
| New York | X | X | 3 |
| North Dakota | | | 0 |
| Oregon | X | X | 7 |
| Pennsylvania | X | X | 4 |
| South Carolina | | | 0 |
| Texas | | | 14 |
| Washington | | X | 11 |
| West Virginia | | | 0 |
| Wisconsin | | X | 3 |

Table I-2

Number of Telephone Interviews Attempted and Completed

| Interviewees | Interviews Attempted | Interviews Completed |
|---|---|---|
| State Directors of Migrant Education | 23 | 21 |
| Section 143 Project Directors | 40 | 34 |
| LEA migrant education staff | 22 | 20 |

For five of the states in the sample, project staff of a concurrent study of migrant education programs funded under Section 141 collected some information in face-to-face interviews. These interviews with SEA and LEA migrant education staff focused on inter/intrastate coordination needs and activities and the use of Section 143-developed products.

An outline of information gathered through unstructured interviews appears as Appendix A to this report. All areas were not covered in all interviews. In each interview, however, we asked questions regarding: (1) assessment of inter/intrastate coordination needs and (2) familiarity with the Section 143 program and its results. In grantee states, we also asked state directors of migrant education and project directors to (1) verify information obtained from ED files and (2) describe more fully the projects and project outcomes for which they were responsible or, alternatively, to refer us to project directors who could provide this information. The 20 states that were in a cooperating status on another state's or other states' project(s) were asked to describe the range of involvement that cooperation on a Section 143 project entailed. Finally, we asked the directors of migrant education in the three states that were neither grantees nor cooperating states in FY 1985 about the reasons for their nonparticipation.

The use of unstructured interview formats for this study limited our capacity to provide quantitative data. We include tabular summaries of interview responses wherever possible and appropriate.

The remainder of this report addresses the research questions posed by ED and refined by Policy Studies Associates. Chapter II provides background on interstate and intrastate coordination in migrant education, including a statutory and regulatory history. Chapter III presents a profile of the Section 143 Interstate and Intrastate Coordination discretionary grants program from 1981 to 1986. Chapter IV is a description of the types of projects funded under Section 143 from 1981 to 1986. Chapter V describes and analyzes project outcomes. The concluding chapter summarizes the study's findings and raises issues concerning future needs for interstate coordination in migrant education. Three appendices follow the report. Appendix A is an outline of topics included in the unstructured interviews. Appendix B contains product and dissemination profiles for a sample of 34 projects. Appendix C provides overviews of the remaining 19 projects for which we were unable to obtain in-depth product information.

## II. BACKGROUND ON INTERSTATE AND INTRASTATE COORDINATION IN MIGRANT EDUCATION

This chapter discusses (1) the statutory and regulatory history of inter/intrastate coordination in migrant education and (2) determination of coordination needs. The following points are of particular interest:

- Congress has been concerned about the need for inter/intrastate coordination since the beginning of federal involvement in migrant education.
- The states have assumed responsibility for identifying and establishing priorities on needs in migrant education.
- Dropout prevention and improvement of secondary services are considered the most pressing needs at the present time.

### The Statutory and Regulatory History of Interstate and Intrastate Coordination in Migrant Education

In 1966, Section 103 of the Education Amendments of 1966 (P.L. 89-750) established the education of migrant children as a special program under ESEA Title I. Under Title V of ESEA,[1] the amendments also required development of procedures that would facilitate the transfer of migrant students' academic and health records as they moved from community to community. This was the seed of the computerized MSRTS and of federal concern about improving interstate and intrastate coordination in migrant education. A February 1969 report of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, entitled "The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States," asserted that the

---

[1] Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate, p. 66.

launching of a records transfer system was "the most significant accomplishment in migrant education" in FY 1967.

A committee of state migrant education specialists cooperatively developed the fledgling MSRTS system. The first meeting of Title I migrant education coordinators took place in 1966; six persons attended. By May 1968, when the first National Convention of State Migrant Coordinators was held in Denver, Colorado, 47 states had designated migrant education specialists. At the Denver meeting, a previously formed steering committee presented a draft for an interstate records transfer system, which was roundly criticized and sent back to the drawing board—an early indication that establishing interstate cooperation would not be easy. The group circulated and approved a revised version of the system in July 1968. The Commissioner of Education made Title I discretionary funds available for initial implementation of the system in October 1968.

Also in 1968, the U.S. Office of Education (USOE) appointed the first director of migrant education within the Title I program. In December of that year, state migrant education specialists met in Washington with USOE staff to develop a plan for improving interstate cooperation during 1969. Participants institutionalized the December planning meeting as an annual forum for the exchange of ideas and information among state and federal migrant education specialists.

As illustrated in the preceding chronology, the issue of inter/intrastate coordination arose early and persistently in the story of federal involvement in migrant education. Migrant educators were convinced from the outset that the particular educational problems

associated with the migrant way of life required special structures and strategies to link the multiple agencies that served a given migrant child.

The difficulties that have been experienced over the years in making inter/intrastate coordination work must in some measure be attributed to the fact that the task flies in the face of the entire American educational tradition. The provision of public education in the United States is and always has been a state and local—but principally a local—prerogative. In general, states set minimum provisions for the education of their citizens, and the localities are free to refine or augment services, standards, and requirements, which most of them do. The result is (at the present time) over 15,000 school districts, each with its own potentially unique scope and sequence of curriculum and other idiosyncracies—a formidable barrier indeed to establishing continuity in a migrant child's education.

In addition to the need for greater inter/intrastate coordination, a second issue that preoccupied migrant educators and policymakers in the early years of federal involvement was leadership. In fact, the two issues were directly related. Promoting and encouraging the coordinated activities among states that were expected to improve migrant education suggested the need for a strong central coordinating entity. Congress intended that USOE should fill this role but in 1969 found the agency's leadership effectiveness wanting:

> The U.S. Office of Education is charged by Congress with the task of administering programs through State, local, or private agencies. The question then becomes one of degree—to what extent is the Office of Education willing, or able, to provide

> leadership and guidance in the execution of those programs? The answer, in too many cases, has been "not enough."[2]

The legislators recommended at that time that future migrant education funding include a provision allotting a fixed percentage of Title I migrant funds to USOE for carrying out state-requested leadership functions and assisting in the implementation of interstate projects.

Both the need for better inter/intrastate coordination and for stronger federal leadership continued as themes in congressional testimony throughout the 1970's. The principal mechanism for establishing coordination during this period remained MSRTS. Following acceptance of the proposed records transfer system by the state directors of migrant education in 1968, USOE awarded a contract to the Arkansas State Department of Education for implementation of the plan. They completed the design in FY 1970 and began full scale operation in FY 1972. The Education Amendments of 1974 cited MSRTS as an appropriate data base for the Commissioner of Education to use in determining allocations to the states for their migrant education programs under Title I.

During the early 1970's, state migrant education coordinators repeatedly lobbied USOE to sanction and take a leadership role in an interstate committee. Lack of action in this area by OE led, in 1975, to the formalization of the previously informal network of state coordinators as the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education (NASDME). NASDME's stated purposes were "to promote

---

[2] Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Subcommittee on Migratory Labor. "The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States." Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1969.

national issues relevant to migrant education and to seek alternative solutions toward effecting interstate cooperation and furthering the effectiveness of communication through the Migrant Student Record Transfer System."[3] Early activities of the organization included development of reading, mathematics, and bilingual oral language skills checklists for inclusion in the MSRTS data base.

From the outset of federal involvement in migrant education in 1966, Title I had authorized states to apply for a program grant on an interstate basis: "A State educational agency or a combination of such agencies [emphasis added] shall . . . be entitled to receive a grant . . . ." The option had never been tested, however. In 1976, the OE Associate Commissioner for Compensatory Educational Programs circulated a memorandum to the chief state school officers, with copies to the state migrant education coordinators, drawing attention to the possibility of cooperative, interstate projects under Title I and outlining the special procedures required for a joint application. It is unclear whether Title I staff developed this memo in response to queries from the states or whether its sole impetus was increased interest at OE in fostering interstate efforts.

In hearings before the House Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education in October 1977, several witnesses emphasized the need for more interstate coordination. Their testimony resulted in the statutory language authorizing what has come to be known as

---

[3] Testimony of Raul de la Rosa, Supervisor of Migrant Education, State of Washington, in hearings before the House of Representatives' Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, October 12, 1977.

the Interstate and Intrastate Migrant Education Coordination Program, enacted as Section 143 of the Education Amendments of 1978 (P.L. 95-561). This section gave a statutory basis to the MSRTS and allowed the Commissioner to make grants or enter into contracts with SEAs for the purpose of improving inter/intrastate coordination among education programs serving migrant students. Appropriations were not to exceed five percent of the total allocated to the states for their Title I migrant education entitlements.

On May 14, 1979, OE published proposed regulations for a discretionary grants program to state educational agencies to meet the special educational needs of migratory children. The proposed rules covered Sections 141-43 of P.L. 95-561. Section 116(d).25—Special projects for coordination of migrant education activities—is quoted below in its entirety:

> In accordance with section 143 of Title I of the Act, the Commissioner may—in consultation with the States—make grants, contracts, or cooperative agreements, with an SEA or SEAs to—
>
> (a) Operate a system for the transfer of school records and other information about migratory children; or
>
> (b) Carry out other activities designed to improve the interstate and intrastate coordination of migrant education projects; or
>
> (c) Both (a) and (b).

OE published final rules in the Federal Register on April 3, 1980. Few comments on the proposed rules related directly to the Section 143 discretionary grant program, which after all had not yet been implemented. However, in response to seven comments, the section covering special discretionary projects for the coordination of migrant education activities—Section 116(d).24—expanded to include examples of the types of projects that might be funded. Illustrative areas

for interstate coordination activities were: (1) transfer of school records; (2) parental involvement; (3) resource centers; (4) identification and recruitment of children; (5) secondary school services; (6) information and dissemination centers; and (7) staff development services. The regulations cautioned that proposals under the new program need not limit themselves to the activities suggested. Even so, applicants interpreted the examples as a list of federal priorities for interstate coordination.

An additional paragraph was appended to the final 1980 regulations for the Section 143 program, requiring a strong advice and consent relationship between the states and the Office of Education:

> Consultation with SEAs. The Commissioner consults fully with the SEAs participating in the Migrant Education Program with respect to the types of projects to be conducted, the priority of funding for these projects, the evaluation of existing projects, and the continuation, expansion, or termination of existing projects.

In 1983, the Department of Education promulgated new, separate regulations for the Section 143 grant program, reflecting the enactment of ECIA Chapter 1 to supersede Title I of ESEA. ED published proposed rules in April 1983, and final regulations appeared in the Federal Register on July 29, 1983. Principal issues raised during the public review period included the following:

- Several commenters recommended that specific mention of continued funding for the MSRTS contract be inserted. No change was made on the grounds that the rules applied only to grants awarded under Section 143.

- Several commenters recommended that the rules include a national needs assessment and national goals for inter/intrastate coordination in migrant education. No change was made. ED asserted a preference for allowing the states the "flexibility" to determine their own coordination needs

and design their own programs to meet those needs. A selection criterion was added regarding a proposal's contribution to addressing unmet national needs.

- Several commenters recommended that ED and NASDME establish priorities for use of funds under Section 143. No change was made. ED preferred to allow the states to choose the program emphases and the states with which they would cooperate.

- One commenter recommended a stronger implementation and dissemination requirement for each project. No change was made. Selection criteria included these points. Furthermore, ED stated that it would "continue to maintain a practice of informally disseminating information about successful projects to the SEAs."

- Several commenters recommended that ED increase its oversight responsibilities for funded projects, including elimination of "overlapping and duplication" in the proposals funded. No change was made. ED said that application scoring and ranking procedures, with final approval by the Secretary, were adequate to respond to this point.

The 1983 regulations highlighted several points that had not been specified in the earlier rules. For example, if a consortium of states was to be involved in a project, the regulations required the applicant SEA to identify each participant state, describe the objectives of the consortium, and describe how "cooperating" states were involved in developing the proposed objectives and activities. The regulations enumerated selection criteria in detail; these were consistent with criteria published for other ED discretionary grants programs after 1981. The internal ED procedures for reviewing applications are included under the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR). A copy of these general rules accompanies each grant application package.

The Section 143 program has operated under the 1983 regulations for the past three years. In 1985, Title IV of the National Science Foundation Authorization (P.L. 99-159) contained the following language:

> Sec. 402. Section 143(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 is amended—
>
> (1) by striking out "grants to, or enter into contracts with," and inserting in lieu thereof "enter into contracts with";

The change was not proposed by the Department of Education and is not explained in hearings or testimony. ED staff generally believe that Congress, in responding to someone's request that the MSRTS contract with the Arkansas State Department of Education be given a specific statutory basis, inadvertently deleted the phrase "grants to." The last Section 143 grants were awarded during 1986 as was the first contract—a study of identification and recruitment procedures awarded to the Pennsylvania SEA. ED plans to award additional contracts in 1987. Some persons interviewed in this study reported that NASDME and the Education Commission of the State's Interstate Migrant Education Council (IMEC) will ask Congress to reinstate the grants program during upcoming reauthorization hearings on Chapter 1.

## The Need for Inter/intrastate Coordination in Migrant Education

Throughout the history of federal involvement in migrant education, special emphasis has been placed on the unique interstate coordination requirements associated with providing continuity in services for migrant children. Intrastate coordination appears to have been of less general concern, although some larger states assert that movement of the bulk of their migratory families is within state boundaries and that a child's education is no less disrupted by in-state

relocations. It is likely that "interstate" coordination, as a phrase, is used in articles, papers, testimony, statutes, and regulations as shorthand for a broader concept that really encompasses necessary cooperation among any state and local educational agencies serving migrant children. We, too, use it in that sense.

Determination of interstate coordination needs. It is clear from the historical overview of interstate coordination concerns in relation to Title I and Chapter 1 that while Congress has been responsive to the logic of states' calls for improved coordination mechanisms in migrant education, committee and subcommittee members have little specific sense of what these needs are beyond the MSRTS. Top officials in ED or OE have, over the years, been reluctant to establish interstate coordination priorities at the federal level. Initiative in this area, therefore, has fallen to the states.

In telephone interviews with 21 state directors of migrant education or their proxies, we attempted to determine (1) the process by which interstate coordination needs and priorities are currently determined and (2) the mechanisms through which identified needs and priorities are shared among agencies at the various governmental levels.

In general, and depending on the particular state structure for operation of migrant education, SEAs determine inter/intrastate coordination needs by synthesizing information provided by the LEAs, regional centers, and other agencies that directly serve migrant students. Respondents in our sample states reported both formal and informal needs assessment procedures. However, informal processes appear to

predominate. Through regularly scheduled state meetings or conferences, monitoring and technical assistance activities, and/or routine telephone communication with migrant education project sites, state level educators obtain an overview of coordination issues and problems encountered locally. As similar problems are identified across multiple agencies serving migrant children, an inter/intrastate coordination need or priority is defined.

We found no instance where a state conducted a separate, formal, specifically interstate coordination needs assessment. However, many states require their local migrant education projects to prepare an annual needs assessment or an evaluation report that includes a section on overall needs. To the extent that coordination needs arise in these documents, they may be considered formal assessments of interstate needs and priorities.

Communication about interstate coordination needs and priorities among the states also takes place both formally and informally. Most, but not all, state level respondents in our sample reported that NASDME sponsors an annual interstate needs survey. The results of this survey are tabulated, discussed, and prioritized by NASDME's Executive Committee and submitted to the federal Migrant Education Program on behalf of the organization's membership. Most states also communicate directly with the federal program staff from time to time about a range of matters, including interstate coordination. Although most states generally recognize NASDME as their representative in these areas, some states prefer to communicate directly with ED.

In the course of a year, there are many opportunities for migrant educators and specialists from all governmental levels to discuss mutual needs and concerns. In addition to the now traditional December state directors' meeting in Washington, DC, NASDME sponsors a national meeting in April. Groups of states associated with the three major migrant "streams" (eastern, central, and western) may also hold their own conferences. Individual states sponsor one or more intrastate meetings annually and the Interstate Migrant Educational Council (IMEC) of the Education Commission of the States holds regular meetings and workshops.

Currently identified interstate coordination needs. Overall, there appears to be ample opportunity for informal exchange of ideas on interstate coordination needs. In June 1986, NASDME circulated the results of its latest survey concerning priorities for the Section 143 program. Twelve areas were named:

1. Identification and recruitment
2. Parent involvement
3. Staff development
4. Curriculum coordination between states
5. Dropout prevention
6. Dissemination
7. SEA/LEA evaluation
8. MSRTS
9. Partnerships in education
10. Child abuse prevention
11. Special education
12. Pre-school education

Based on this list, the NASDME Executive Committee developed five broader priorities related to interstate cooperation for submission to ED: (1) secondary education services; (2) a national migrant education service center; (3) project assessment; (4) a longitudinal study of migrant education; and (5) interagency coordination. Of

these, the states nominated secondary education services as their number one priority.

We asked the states in our sample to comment on what they currently saw as future priorities in interstate coordination, with the following results:

| Topic | No. of Times Mentioned |
|---|---|
| Dropouts and secondary services | 9 |
| Curriculum coordination | 2 |
| Better data | 2 |
| Intrastate/intragency coordination | 2 |
| Child abuse prevention | 1 |
| Staff training | 1 |
| Parent involvement | 1 |
| Bilingual instruction | 1 |

The results of our small survey corroborate the suggested emphases forwarded to ED by NASDME. At the present time, the states see keeping migrant adolescents in school through improved programs and services as the most critical issue. It is our understanding that at least one of the Section 143 contracts to be awarded in 1987 will focus on this area, indicating that state-federal communication channels are functioning. The other contracts to be awarded are also expected to address priorities identified by the states.

# III. PROFILE OF THE SECTION 143 INTERSTATE AND INTRASTATE COORDINATION PROGRAM

This chapter presents a descriptive synopsis of the migrant education inter/intrastate coordination program. Topics include: (1) total annual funding of the Section 143 program; (2) applicants; (3) project level funding, including single year and multiple year grants; (4) grant recipients; and (5) the involvement of "cooperating" states. Principal findings include the following:

- During the period 1981-86, the Section 143 program made 108 awards, totaling $13,849,206 to 53 discrete projects.
- The mean award for the period was $128,233 and the range was from $24,295 to $395,969.
- New York and Pennsylvania between them have received 47 percent of total Section 143 funding and 45 percent of all grants awarded. They are perceived by the other states as having the time and resources to carry out grant activities.
- Most grants involve other states in a "cooperating" status that can range from pro forma involvement to responsibility for developing one or more final products.

## Funding Profile of Section 143 Grants, FYs 1981-86

Total funding. Table III-1 provides a funding history of the Section 143 program during the period FYs 1981-86. During that time, ED awarded $13,849,206 through 108 grants. For the purposes of this report, the 1981 grant of $948,082 to New York (cited as a single award in most funding tables) is counted as seven separate grants since the funds supported seven different project components. Use of the single larger figure distorts summary statistics for the program. Information about the individual components of the New York grant is as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Xerox materials dissemination | $118,113 |
| Tutorial Outreach | 126,938 |
| Goals for Youth | 82,000 |
| Bilingual/Bicultural Institute | 52,894 |
| Handicapped services | 72,441 |
| Interstate Migrant Secondary Services Project | 260,865 |
| Health and Education | 234,831* |
| | $948,082 |

*The amount for "Health and Education" is an estimate based on the funding information obtained about the preceding six components.

Table III-1

Section 143 Funding Profile
FYs 1981-86

| FY | Total Funding | No. Grants Awarded | Mean Grant Award | Median Grant Award | Grants Range |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1981 | $ 1,982,717 | 18 | $110,151 | $ 91,975 | $29,732 - $260,865 |
| 1982 | 3,104,159 | 24 | 129,340 | 125,536 | 41,113 - 282,251 |
| 1983 | 2,066,691 | 13 | 158,976 | 146,515 | 24,295 - 395,969 |
| 1984 | 2,073,502 | 16 | 129,594 | 121,022 | 53,036 - 244,780 |
| 1985 | 2,080,666 | 20 | 104,033 | 86,515 | 49,218 - 238,276 |
| 1986 | 2,541,471 | 17 | 149,498 | 122,290 | 96,941 - 292,027 |
| 1981-86 | $13,849,206 | 108 | $128,233 | $121,638 | $24,295 - $395,969 |

The average number of grants ED awards per year is 18; the median is 16 and the range 13-24. The peak year for both total funding ($3,104,159) and number of awards (24) was 1982. 1983 was distinguished by the smallest number of grants (13), the largest and smallest awards ($395,969 and $24,295), and the highest mean and median awards ($158,976 and $146,515).

The largest grant ever awarded ($395,969) went in 1983 to New York for the Interstate Migrant Secondary Services Project (IMSSP). IMSSP also received the largest grants in fiscal years 1981, 1982, and 1984 ($260,865, $282,251, and $244,780 respectively).

Number of applications received. Table III-2 shows the relationship between the number of applications received and the number of awards made for each year of the Section 143 grant program.

Table III-2

Ratio of Applications to Awards
Section 143 Program
FYs 1981-86

| FY | No. of Applications Received | No. of Awards Made | % of Applications Funded |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1981 | 18* | 12 | 48% |
| 1982 | 41 | 24 | 59 |
| 1983 | 40 | 13 | 33 |
| 1984 | 28 | 16 | 57 |
| 1985 | 33 | 20 | 61 |
| 1986 | 22 | 16 | 73 |
| TOTAL | 182 | 101 | 55% |

*In the first year of the program, New York's and California's applications actually included several discrete projects.

The number of applications received in a given year does not translate into the number of different SEAs submitting proposals since, after 1981, some states offered multiple projects for consideration. In 1982, for example, Indiana submitted five proposals and received three grants; New York submitted 10 applications and received six awards. In 1983, Indiana, New York, and California among them wrote 22 of the 40 applications submitted.

The drop in the number of applications in 1986 probably reflects the states' knowledge that this would be the final year for Section 143 grants. New awards made in that year would have no prospect of continuing as grants in subsequent years.

Profile of Grantees

Only SEAs are eligible to apply for Section 143 inter/intrastate coordination grants. In all cases, then, an SEA is the official fiscal agent or grantee of record. Actual project work may or may not be carried out by SEA staff. (Information on the location of project staff and activities is discussed in Chapter IV.)

Table III-3 lists the 21 states that were awarded one or more Section 143 grants in FYs 1981-86, the total number of grants received by each state, its total program funding, and the average award per state.

New York and Pennsylvania have received 47 percent of the total Section 143 grant funding ($6,468,161) and 45 percent of all grants awarded. California, New York, and Pennsylvania together account for 55 percent of total funding ($7,639,095) and 51 percent of all grants. New York, Indiana, and Mississippi have each received Section 143 grant money in every year since 1981. Pennsylvania has received awards every year since 1982. Interviews with state directors of migrant education suggest that, although New York and Pennsylvania are not large migrant receiving states, they have the time and resources available to apply for and carry out grant activities.

Table III- 3

Section 143 Grant Recipients
FYs 1981-86

| State | No. Grants Received | Total Funding | Average Award |
|---|---|---|---|
| New York | 34 | $ 4,475,631 | $131,636 |
| Pennsylvania | 15 | 1,992,530 | 132,835 |
| California | 6 | 1,170,934 | 195,156 |
| Indiana | 9 | 826,641 | 91,849 |
| Mississippi | 6 | 661,694 | 110,282 |
| Minnesota | 4 | 616,857 | 154,214 |
| Louisiana | 4 | 569,802 | 142,451 |
| Florida | 2 | 461,686 | 230,843 |
| Maryland | 3 | 399,830 | 133,277 |
| Georgia | 4 | 350,840 | 87,710 |
| Washington | 2 | 321,581 | 160,791 |
| Arkansas | 3 | 306,263 | 102,088 |
| Michigan | 2 | 289,542 | 144,771 |
| Oregon | 3 | 261,934 | 87,311 |
| New Jersey | 2 | 252,879 | 126,440 |
| Maine | 1 | 238,379 | 238,379 |
| Virginia | 2 | 196,085 | 98,043 |
| Wisconsin | 2 | 172,279 | 86,140 |
| Connecticut | 2 | 126,521 | 63,261 |
| Kansas | 1 | 88,266 | 88,226 |
| Dist. of Col. | 1 | 69,032 | 69,032 |
| 21 | 108 | $13,849,206 | |

In terms of the migrant stream patterns identified in a May 1983 General Accounting Office report,[4] the Western Stream states (California, Oregon, and Washington) have received 10 percent (11) of the 108 grants awarded. The Central Stream states (Arkansas, Indiana, Kansas, Louisiana, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, and Wisconsin) have received 29 percent (31) of the total grants awarded. The Eastern

[4] U.S. General Accounting Office. Analysis of Migration Characteristics of Children Served Under the Migrant Education Program. May 2, 1983.

Stream states (Connecticut, District of Columbia, Florida, Georgia, Maryland, Maine, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Virginia) have received 61 percent (66) of the total grants, principally because of New York and Pennsylvania (see Table III-4).

Table III-4

Migrant Stream Patterns in Grants Awarded
FYs 1981-86

| Migrant Stream | No. of Grants | Funding Received |
|---|---|---|
| Western | 11 | $ 1,754,449 |
| Central | 31 | 3,531,344 |
| Eastern | 66 | 8,563,413 |
| TOTAL | 108 | $13,849,206 |

Profile of Project Level Funding

Table III-5 (pp 28-29) provides a summary funding history of all migrant inter- and intrastate coordination projects for FYs 1981-86. The funding is presented by state and project title for each year, along with a total. The seven components in the 1981 New York grant of $948,082 are listed individually (see table footnote).

New and continuing grants. Table III-6 shows the number of new and continuation grants that have been funded during the period FYs 1981-86. For the purposes of this report, a continuation grant has been defined as two or more years of funding for a project that maintains the same, or similar, objectives. Multiple-year funding for such grants is not necessarily in consecutive years.

Table III-6

New and Continuation Grants
FYs 1981-86

| Year | Number of New Grants Awarded | Number of Continuations |
|---|---|---|
| 1981 | 18 | — |
| 1982 | 16 | 8 |
| 1983 | 2 | 11 |
| 1984 | 2 | 14 |
| 1985 | 7 | 13 |
| 1986 | 4 | 13 |
| TOTAL | 49 | 59 |

Of the 11 continuation grants in 1983, four projects were in their third year of funding. In 1984, nine projects had also been funded for three preceding years. Of the 13 continuation grants in 1985, 10 were in their third year. Six of the 1986 continuation grants had been funded as continuations in 1985.

Cooperating states. The 1983 regulations for the Section 143 program stipulate that grant applications involving consortia provide documentation of states' willingness to participate and a description of the roles they will play in planning and carrying out grant activities. Most applications do include names of one or more "cooperating" states. We attempted to determine the range of involvement that participation as a cooperating state entails. Twenty states in the sample had been in a cooperating status on one or more projects in FY 1985.

Table III-7 (pp 30-31) provides a summary of all states and their cooperating status for FYs 1981-86. The table indicates the number of times a state has served as a cooperating state with each of the

Table III-5

Funding History of Migrant Inter- and Intrastate Coordination Projects

| Grantee SEA | Project Title | 1986 | 1985 | 1984 | 1983 | 1982 | 1981 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Arkansas | Project DISNET | $ --- | $ 99,558 | $ 85,536 | $ --- | $ --- | $ --- | $ 185,094 |
| Arkansas | Improving Services for Migrants via State Migrant PAC | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 121,169 | 121,169 |
| California | Evaluation Model for MEP & CAMP | --- | --- | 143,576 | --- | --- | --- | 143,576 |
| California | Gifted & Talented Migrant Education Service Center | --- | --- | --- | --- | 272,000 | --- | 272,000 |
| California | Western Stream Program Improvement Program | 176,157 | 163,926 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 340,083 |
| California | Western Secondary Team Project | 279,275 | 136,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 415,275 |
| Connecticut | Migrant Youth Vocational Project | --- | --- | 85,408 | --- | 41,113 | --- | 126,521 |
| Dist. of Col. | Migrant Training Internship | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 69,032 | 69,032 |
| Florida | Migrant Dropout Model | 223,410 | 238,276 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 461,686 |
| Georgia | Staff Development Services | --- | --- | 97,880 | 123,665 | 99,295 | --- | 320,840 |
| Georgia | Career Education | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 30,000 | 30,000 |
| Indiana | Migrant Education Secondary Educ. Career Awareness | --- | --- | --- | --- | 57,000 | --- | 57,000 |
| Indiana | Migrant Education Recruitment Identification Task Force Project (MERIT) | --- | --- | --- | 24,295 | 162,543 | 136,666 | 323,504 |
| Indiana | Migrant Education Interstate Parent Training Program/Network | 103,362 | 76,250 | 53,036 | --- | 136,880 | 76,609 | 446,137 |
| Kansas | Pre-School Readiness in Migrant Education | --- | 88,266 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 88,266 |
| Louisiana | Project MEMDIC | 129,338 | --- | 198,675 | --- | 163,451 | --- | 491,464 |
| Louisiana | Career Education Skills for Migrant Students | --- | --- | --- | --- | 78,338 | --- | 78,338 |
| Maine | Pilot Project to Determine Feasibility of National Evaluation of Migrant Children | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 238,379 | 238,379 |
| Maryland | Migrant Dropout Youth Project | --- | 213,714 | 156,384 | --- | --- | --- | 370,098 |
| Maryland | Delaware-Maryland Interstate Training Project | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 29,732 | 29,732 |
| Michigan | Migrant Youth Employability Development | --- | --- | --- | --- | 141,723 | --- | 141,723 |
| Michigan | Title I Migrant Evaluation System (TIMES) | --- | --- | --- | --- | 147,819 | --- | 147,819 |
| Minnesota | National Migrant Special Education Center Project | 150,487 | 175,000 | 188,370 | --- | --- | --- | 513,857 |
| Minnesota | Career Related Curric. & Ser. for Migrant Students | --- | --- | --- | --- | 103,000 | --- | 103,000 |
| Mississippi | National Material and Resource Center | 117,186 | 59,653 | 143,073 | 138,498 | 84,761 | 188,523 | 661,694 |
| New Jersey | Secondary School Career Education Needs Assessment Model for Migratory Students | --- | --- | --- | --- | 157,870 | 95,009 | 252,879 |
| New York | Migrant Bilingual Teacher Training Program | --- | --- | --- | --- | 71,006 | 52,894[a] | 123,900 |
| New York | Goals for Youth | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 82,000[a] | 82,000 |
| New York | Health and Education | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 234,831[a,b] | 234,831 |
| New York | Interstate Migrant Secondary Ser. Project (IMSSP) | --- | --- | 244,780 | 359,969 | 282,251 | 260,865[a] | 1,147,865 |
| New York | National Migrant Special Education Center | --- | --- | --- | 226,143 | 127,810 | 72,441[a] | 426,394 |
| New York | Step Beyond | 122,106 | 64,286 | --- | --- | --- | 118,113[a] | 304,505 |
| New York | Tutorial Outreach | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 126,938[a] | 126,938 |
| New York | Project CHOICE | --- | 49,218 | 119,592 | 179,007 | 123,261 | --- | 471,078 |
| New York | Computer Assisted Placement Reading/Mathematics (CAPR/CAPM) | 100,561 | 62,433 | 72,630 | 106,556 | 93,682 | --- | 435,862 |
| New York | Eastern Stream Child Abuse Prevention and Education (ESCAPE) | --- | 110,000 | 128,634 | 176,224 | 77,111 | --- | 491,969 |

Table III-5
(Continued)

Funding History of Migrant Inter- and Intrastate Coordination Projects

| Grantee SEA | Project Title | 1986 | 1985 | 1984 | 1983 | 1982 | 1981 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| New York | Migrant Educations' National Training Outreach (MENTOR) | $ 142,586 | $ 58,897 | $ --- | $ --- | $ --- | $ --- | $ 201,483 |
| New York | Migrant Education National Pilot Study | --- | 84,764 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 84,764 |
| New York | GRAPE- grade retention | 104,317 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 104,317 |
| New York | MAP - Migrant Attrition Project | 123,966 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 123,966 |
| New York | Training Video for Parents-Special Ed ation | 115,759 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 115,759 |
| Oregon | Oregon Special Education Project | 96,941 | 70,000 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 166,941 |
| Oregon | Career-Based Educational & Support Services to Migrant Students | --- | --- | --- | --- | 94,993 | --- | 94,993 |
| Pennsylvania | Community Awareness and Resources Efforts (CARE) | --- | 75,922 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 75,922 |
| Pennsylvania | Teaching Environmental Awareness to the Children of the Harvest (TEACH) | --- | 98,834 | 103,224 | 175,632 | 129,978 | --- | 507,668 |
| Pennsylvania | Health Awareness Pattern Preventing Illness & Encouraging Responsibility (HAPPIER) | --- | 81,701 | 72,923 | 124,222 | --- | --- | 278,846 |
| Pennsylvania | Migrant Education Resource List Information Network Clearinghouse (MERLIN) | 122,290 | 120,182 | 122,451 | 146,515 | 159,129 | --- | 670,567 |
| Pennsylvania | Mr. Rogers Neighborhood--Migrant Children are Special | --- | 167,500 | --- | --- | --- | --- | 167,500 |
| Pennsylvania | I & R Contract | 292,027 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 292,027 |
| Virginia | Migrant Program Staff Development Project | --- | --- | --- | --- | 107,145 | 88,940 | 196,085 |
| Washington | Individualized Bilingual Instruction (IBI) | --- | --- | --- | 129,581 | 192,000 | --- | 321,581 |
| Wisconsin | Migrant Education Item Bank | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 30,576 | 30,576 |
| Wisconsin | Mini-PASS | 141,703 | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | 141,703 |
| | TOTAL | $2,541,471 | $2,080,666 | $2,073,502 | $2,066,691 | $3,104,159 | $1,982,717 | $13,849,206 |

[a]New York's 1981 award of $948,082 supported seven different components. Some of the components formed the basis for individual awards in succeeding years.

[b]This amount is an approximation based on funding information obtained about the remaining six components.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table III-7

Section 143 Cooperating State Status
By Grantee States
(FYs 1981-86)

| State | GRANTEE STATES | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | AR | CA | CT | DC | FL | GA | IN | KS | LA | ME | MD | MI | MN | MS | NJ | NY | OR | PA | VA | WA | WI | Total[a] |
| Alabama | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | 4 | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 7 |
| Arkansas | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | 3 | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | -- | 7 | -- | 5 | -- | -- | -- | 19 |
| Alaska | -- | 3 | -- | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3 | -- | -- | -- | 8 |
| Arizona | -- | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | 1 | 1 | 7 | -- | 9 | -- | -- | -- | 26 |
| California | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | 1 | -- | 1 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | 8 | 1 | 10 | -- | -- | -- | 25 |
| Colorado | -- | 5 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | 1 | -- | 8 | -- | -- | -- | 17 |
| Connecticut | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 5 |
| Delaware | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 9 |
| Dist. of Col. | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 1 | 1 | -- | -- | 2 | -- | -- | 6 |
| Florida | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 5 | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | -- | 18 | -- | 10 | 2 | -- | -- | 44 |
| Georgia | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | 2 | -- | -- | 1 | -- | 3 | -- | 3 | 2 | -- | -- | 14 |
| Hawaii | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 |
| Idaho | -- | 4 | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | 6 | 1 | 2 | -- | -- | -- | 16 |
| Illinois | 3 | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | 1 | 1 | 8 | -- | 10 | -- | -- | 1 | 31 |
| Indiana | 3 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | 1 | 2 | -- | 10 | -- | 8 | -- | -- | -- | 27 |
| Iowa | 1 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 6 |
| Kansas | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 7 |
| Kentucky | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3 | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 5 |
| Louisiana | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3 | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3 | 1 | -- | 2 | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | 14 |
| Maine | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 4 |
| Maryland | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | 1 | 10 | -- | 7 | 1 | -- | -- | 24 |
| Massachusetts | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 10 | -- | 8 | -- | -- | -- | 20 |
| Michigan | 3 | 1 | -- | -- | 1 | 1 | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3 | -- | -- | 14 | -- | 1 | -- | -- | 1 | 29 |
| Minnesota | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | 1 | -- | 8 | -- | 9 | -- | -- | 1 | 23 |
| Mississippi | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | 1 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 7 |
| Missouri | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | 1 | -- | 1 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 5 |
| Montana | -- | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | 6 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 12 |
| Nebraska | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 4 |
| Nevada | -- | 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | 6 |
| New Hampshire | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | 7 | -- | 3 | 1 | -- | -- | 12 |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table III-7
(Continued)

Section 143 Cooperating State Status
By Grantee States
(FYs 1981-86)

| | GRANTEE STATES | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| State | AR | CA | CT | DC | FL | GA | IN | KS | LA | ME | MD | MI | MN | MS | NJ | NY | OR | PA | VA | WA | WI | Total[a] |
| New Jersey | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | 10 | -- | 1 | 1 | -- | -- | 16 |
| New Mexico | -- | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | 1 | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 7 |
| New York | -- | 1 | -- | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 6 | -- | -- | -- | 13 |
| North Dakota | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 |
| North Carolina | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | 2 | -- | -- | 2 | -- | 1 | -- | 2 | 1 | -- | 6 | -- | 8 | 1 | -- | -- | 25 |
| Ohio | 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | 1 | 1 | -- | 6 | -- | 8 | -- | -- | 1 | 22 |
| Oklahoma | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | 1 | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 5 |
| Oregon | -- | 5 | -- | -- | 1 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | 1 | -- | 9 | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | 21 |
| Pennsylvania | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 1 | 15 | -- | -- | 2 | -- | -- | 25 |
| Puerto Rico | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 1 | -- | 5 | -- | -- | -- | 8 |
| Rhode Island | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 4 |
| South Carolina | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | 4 |
| South Dakota | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | 1 | -- | 1 | -- | -- | 1 | 6 |
| Tennessee | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 3 |
| Texas | 3 | 5 | -- | -- | 2 | -- | 7 | -- | 1 | 1 | -- | -- | 2 | 1 | -- | 16 | 1 | 9 | -- | 2 | -- | 50 |
| Utah | -- | 4 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | 1 | -- | 4 | -- | 8 | -- | -- | -- | 20 |
| Vermont | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | 6 | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 10 |
| Virginia | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 1 | 3 | -- | 8 | -- | -- | -- | 13 |
| Washington | 1 | 5 | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | -- | 14 | 1 | 12 | -- | -- | -- | 37 |
| West Virginia | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 0 |
| Wisconsin | 3 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | -- | 2 | -- | 2 | -- | 2 | -- | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 11 |
| Wyoming | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 1 | -- | 2 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | 5 |

[a]This number does not reflect cooperation on separate, discrete grants. It includes participation by cooperating states on multi-year projects with the same grantee.





BEST COPY AVAILABLE

21 grantees and the total number of times it has been in a cooperating relationship between 1981 and 1986. The total number of times a state has been in a cooperating status counts participation in each individual year of multiyear projects.

The District of Columbia 1981 grant and Connecticut's two grants had no cooperating states. These projects were listed as intrastate. To our knowledge, they are the only three exclusively intrastate projects.

At one time or another, 44 states have been in a cooperating relationship on at least one New York grant. The eight states that have not worked with New York are Arkansas, Hawaii, Kentucky, Maryland, Mississippi, Nevada, South Carolina, and West Virginia. Thirty-five states have been involved in one or more of Pennsylvania's projects.

The range for total number of times a state has been in a cooperating status is from zero (West Virginia) to 50 (Texas). Hawaii engaged in cooperation once with the 1984 Mississippi Resource Center; 21 other states also cooperated on that project. North Dakota has cooperated only twice and Tennessee three times. In general, there is a direct relationship between the size of a state's year-round or seasonal migrant population and the number of Section 143 grants with which it becomes involved.

The mean number of times a state has been in a cooperating status is 14; the median is 11.5. Texas, Florida, and Washington have cooperated on 46 percent, 41 percent, and 34 percent, respectively, of the total 108 grants awarded between 1981 and 1986.

When approached by a prospective grantee, most states informally determine if they should enter into the relationship. Questions used by migrant staff in deciding whether to cooperate on a project include:

How credible is the project?

What services can the state expect to get from the cooperation?

Does the project meet a need within the state's migrant program?

One state in our sample employed formal criteria in their decision-making about project participation.

Most states surveyed replied that their level of cooperation varies widely. The range of participation includes: (1) serving as a cooperating state in name only; (2) serving on an advisory or steering committee; (3) offering opinions or advice over the phone, in letters, or at conferences; (4) reviewing draft materials; and (5) developing products.

The large number of cooperating relationships that some states enter into suggests that participation in many projects must be of low intensity, such as serving on an advisory committee or product review panel. It is unlikely that state migrant education directors have the staff for time-consuming engagement in 50, 44, or 37 projects, for example, over a six year period.

As a rule, the state director in a cooperating state assigns a staff person to be the contact with the grantee. Two states specifically mentioned that their level of involvement depends on how actively the grantee pushes them to participate. Six states noted that they become more actively involved with a grant if the project meets some identified need(s) in their state. Two states commented that they are "very involved" with a limited number of the projects they cooperate

on but maintain a pro forma involvement with the rest. This is likely a typical pattern. One state finds that active involvement in a cooperating status is less taxing but no less useful than actually being the grantee. It is worth noting that some grantees reported occasional difficulty in soliciting active involvement from some cooperating states.

Nonparticipating states. The Section 143 program is notable for the fact that a very large number of states participate in the program —as grantees, as cooperating states, or both. According to the best information that we were able to obtain, only West Virginia has never participated. In 1985, there were three nonparticipating states: the District of Columbia, South Carolina, and West Virginia. Interviews with the migrant education coordinators in those states indicated that the principal reasons for nonparticipation are (1) limited numbers of staff at the SEA and (2) a small migrant population.

The District of Columbia was a Section 143 grantee in 1981. Since that time, it has been a cooperating state with four other projects but actively involved with only one. South Carolina was active in the Georgia staff development consortium, which lost its funding in 1985. In previous years, the state had participated in two other projects. Because of staff changes, it refused other invitations to participate in 1985.

West Virginia serves only about 100 migrant students annually; of these, about 25 are "regulars." Although the state has not accepted invitations to cooperate formally with Section 143 projects, staff participate in national and Eastern Stream conferences as frequently as possible and are aware of some of the program's accomplishments.

## IV. DESCRIPTION OF INTERSTATE AND INTRASTATE COORDINATION PROJECTS, FYs 1981-86

This chapter describes characteristics of a sample of Section 143 interstate and intrastate coordination grants funded between FY 1981 and FY 1986. The Section 143 program funded 53 discrete projects between 1981 and 1986. Our telephone interviews yielded some information on 40 (75 percent) of these and good information on 34 (64 percent). The total number of projects reported on in the analytic categories presented below varies depending on the accuracy or completeness of the information we were able to obtain from individual projects on a given topic.

Principal findings include the following:

- Most projects are carried out at a state educational agency or an institution of higher education.
- Most projects fall into eight broad categories: career education (12); networks/resource centers (10); evaluation models/pilot studies (6); secondary services/dropout prevention (6); special education (4); staff development (4); and health (3).
- Principal activities include training, technical assistance, and curriculum development.
- Although most projects include activities that may be utilized by migrant educators in other states, the principal focus of most grants is <u>not</u> inter/intrastate coordination.

### Project Sites

Although an SEA must be the applicant and fiscal agent for a Section 143 grant, projects are not necessarily carried out at or by a state department of education. Table IV-1 shows the locus of coordination and major activities for 39 projects.

Table IV-1

Project Sites for Section 143 Grants
(n=39)

| State Educational Agency | Institution of Higher Education | Regional Agency | Other |
|---|---|---|---|
| 18 (46%) | 14 (36%) | 3 (8%) | 4 (10%) |

Almost half of the projects in the sample were based at a state department of education. University-based projects are also prevalent, particularly in New York, California, and Georgia.

Three projects were based in a regional agency. California has created a regional structure for administering migrant education programs in the state, and two of its four Section 143 projects have been carried out within this structure. One New York project was based at one of the state's Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES), an administrative structure for providing services to several local school districts.

The "other" category in the table above includes one local educational agency in Mississippi, two projects based at the large migrant services center in Hope, Arkansas, and an Oregon project carried out by the partially federally funded Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.

Staffing Structure

Thirty-seven projects provided information about the staffing of their Section 143 activities. In 17 instances, SEA staff were the principal personnel working on a project. This includes, in some cases, individuals at regional offices or centers supported through

state funds. Thirteen projects were staffed principally by college or university people. The vast majority of these projects were carried out in the State University of New York system.

Whether SEA or university-based, a number of projects supplemented their staffing arrangements with consultants or special hires for particular portions of a project's activities, e.g. field research, training sessions, or writing and editing. Three projects reported occasional use of volunteers. Only one project in our sample was based in an LEA and employed local migrant education specialists.

Target Audiences

Depending on the activities planned for a particular project, certain groups can be identified as the direct audience. Among the 34 projects for which we obtained reliable information on direct audiences, 23 were addressed to migrant educators—a category that encompasses teachers and administrators at local, state, and (where relevant) regional levels. Four projects considered migrant children their principal direct audience, three were specifically working with parents, and an additional four had multiple target audiences.

Project Categories

Projects funded under Section 143 fall into eight thematic categories. Table IV-2 shows the general categories identified and the number of projects funded within each area. All 53 discrete projects are represented in this table.

An "other" category has been included to cover projects not easily subsumed under the eight themes. This category includes two projects focused on early childhood education, two on bilingual

education, and two projects to develop basic skills checklists. The remaining two projects addressed the prevention of child abuse and gifted and talented migrant children.

Table IV-2

Categories of Section 143 Funded Projects
FYs 1981-86

| Topical Category | No. of Projects |
|---|---|
| Career education | 12 |
| National or migrant stream networks/resource centers | 10 |
| Evaluation models/pilot studies | 6 |
| Secondary services/dropout prevention | 6 |
| Special education | 4 |
| Staff development | 4 |
| Health | 3 |
| Other | 8 |
| TOTAL | 53 |

Career education projects were targeted at junior and senior high school students. The strong emphasis on career education projects appears to be related to the frequent exclusion of currently migratory students from secondary vocational education programs. In many high schools, popular vocational courses fill all their available openings early in the school year. A migrant student enrolling in late fall therefore has limited options.

The combination of career education with secondary services and dropout prevention initiatives shows that 18 projects, or about one-third (34 percent), of all Section 143 grants between 1981 and 1986 focused on the special problems of the adolescent migrant child. This is, not surprisingly, the single most identifiable emphasis in the program. For years, the migrant student dropout rate has been

estimated at about 90 percent.[5] (One of the last Section 143 grants to be awarded—New York's Migrant Attrition Project—is presently conducting research on the dropout rate of currently migratory children who were registered with MSRTS as seventh graders in 1981.) Keeping migrant adolescents interested and connected with schools is a major concern.

Relationship of Continuation Grant to Original Grant

Information about the relationship of continuation grants to the goals and activities originally proposed was obtained through the survey sample. As a rule, a multiyear project's first year activities consisted of building a network or a data base; conducting needs assessments, surveys or research; or drafting instructional materials. These types of information were then used as foundations for the succeeding years of the projects. Some continuation grants established the project in one or two states the first year and then expanded it to other states. Refinement of products and dissemination activities typically occurred in the second and third years of a grant. If one aspect of the project proved to be more successful than others in the first year, efforts were sometimes concentrated on expansion in this area in succeeding years.

Project Activities

Based on information obtained through telephone interviews and examination of a sample of project applications at ED, we found that Section 143 grant activities fall into seven basic categories. Table

---

[5] See, for example, Exotech Systems, Inc., Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title I Programs for Migrant Children of Agricultural Workers (1974).

IV-3 shows the distribution of those activities for 34 projects. The tabulation reflects our judgment regarding the one or two principal activities that characterized a project. Thus, for example, while virtually all projects engage in some dissemination of products (see Chapter V), only five out of the 34 had dissemination as a major component.

Table IV-3

Principal Activities of
Section 143 Projects, FYs 1981-86*
(n = 34)

| Activity | No. of Projects |
|---|---|
| Training/technical assistance | 20 |
| Curriculum development | 14 |
| Network development | 7 |
| Design of models/criteria | 5 |
| Dissemination | 5 |
| Research | 4 |
| Data base/resource guide development | 3 |
| Other | 7 |

*Some projects, particularly those with multiple year funding, have had more than one principal activity.

Providing training or technical assistance—on either an intra- or interstate basis—is by far the most common activity for Section 143 projects. Usually, it is a secondary activity, following the development of a model, program, product, or strategy. In interviews, we learned that prior to this discretionary grants program, state migrant educators frequently encountered state restrictions on interstate travel funds that acted as a barrier to interstate coordination. A large proportion of Section 143 human and capital resources has been invested in the provision of training and technical assistance, both within and across state lines. Although the strong

training and technical assistance function of Section 143 grants confirms the program's central focus on cooperation and coordination, it does not really explain what coordination means in migrant education. Projects funded under other federal discretionary grant programs—the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education and the Women's Educational Equity Act Program, for example—also emphasize training as a feature of their dissemination plans.

Activities that precede training vary, with curriculum development conducted most frequently. Projects may create materials for direct use with students (workbooks, audio or videotapes, etc.), guides for use by instructors, or both. Alternatively, they may produce training modules or programs to facilitate the export of a curriculum or model developed under other auspices—sometimes for other populations. Washington's Individualized Bilingual Instruction (IBI) project is an example of this approach. The curriculum was developed at the Northwest Regional Education Laboratory and is a National Diffusion Network program. A Section 143 grant supported training of migrant educators in IBI's use. Newly developed data bases, such as New York's Computer Assisted Program in Reading/Math (CAPR/M), are also likely to require training prior to implementation.

A significant number of projects in our sample (seven projects) cite the development of a network and/or improvement of coordination within a weakly established communication network as their central goal and the focus of their activities. Such networks may be interstate, intrastate, or interagency. Examples include New York's Interstate Migrant Secondary School Project (IMSSP), Arkansas' DISNET (dissemination network), and Minnesota's career education project.

IMSSP sought to link sending and receiving school districts in order to facilitate agreement on high school graduation requirements and the use of similar instructional methods and materials. DISNET established a communications network for 14 states in the Central Stream, coordinating distribution of information on services available in each state to migrant families. The Minnesota Career Education project focused on developing an interagency network for collection of career-related resources.

The business of establishing linkages appears to be at the heart of what migrant educators mean when they refer to coordination. There are degrees of connection, however. At the most superficial level, persons or agencies with similar concerns or offering similar or complementary services are made aware of each other. An intermediate level is represented by occasional face-to-face meetings of such individuals or organizations. A fully developed network sustains regular and frequent contact among the parties. Some Section 143 projects that emphasize networking have been funded for several years, incrementally building the relationship and thereby increasing the possibility that a network will continue when funding is discontinued. IMSSP's work with the secondary school credit exchange is perhaps the most far-reaching and mature networking effort sponsored under Section 143.[6]

---

[6] In the past, migrant secondary school students encountered great difficulty in carrying completed or partially completed credits with them as they moved because of the essential noncomparability in course content between school districts. Prior to implementation of Section 143, Texas and Washington had begun to establish close cooperation between sending and receiving districts to alleviate this problem. IMSSP extended acceptance of this idea through technical assistance, research, and other activities.

Other Section 143 activities include the design of models or evaluation and assessment criteria for various aspects of migrant education. For example, California's gifted and talented project sought to develop identification criteria applicable to migrant children who are gifted or talented. The 1985 New York-based "Pilot Study" was designed to develop and test the feasibility of a national evaluation model for measuring the achievement of migrant students. California also developed and conducted an evaluation of the High School Equivalency Programs (HEP) and College Assistance for Migrants Programs (CAMP), which are aimed at helping migrant youth complete high school and enter college. In general, projects engaging in model development or evaluation propose a design phase and a field test or implementation phase for their activities.

A small number of projects engage in survey research on specific topics related to migrant education, such as the number of handicapped migrant children or descriptors of the large migrant dropout population. Research is usually a small component of a project with broader goals designed to address the educational needs of some subset of migrant students.

In our sample, the category designated as "other" includes several projects whose principal activities did not fit the seven identified categories. Two projects expended most of their resources on developing local sites for career education field trips. For example, if a student was interested in health care, a visit to a hospital was arranged. Another arranged local internships for secondary school students. A third sponsored counseling for adolescents. In one sense, these projects can be defined as models for migrant education,

but their principal focus is locally based and individualized. Two other grants were principally engaged in collecting materials for redistribution to migrant education programs.

Overall, the activities associated with Section 143 projects are similar to those described in reports on other education-related discretionary grants programs. Projects are funded to develop materials, curricula, models, or data bases, which are then extended, through training activities, to a wider audience. In part, this is simply a reflection of the standard methods that have been adopted throughout the education field for introducing and implementing new ideas or approaches.

In this particular instance, the Section 143 migrant education discretionary grants program is tied, by statute and regulation, to the specific theme of inter/intrastate coordination. Indeed, the program has supported a number of projects with precisely that theme, notably the secondary school credit transfer system, the attempts to establish national evaluation models for various aspects of migrant education, and the broadly based information networks such as MENDIC, MERLIN, or DISNET.

However, a far greater number of projects have addressed recognized needs in migrant education that are <u>not</u> clearly focused on coordination among and within states. For example, while the 12 career education models and curricula developed under Section 143 grants may well fill a void in the materials available to secondary school migrant educators, and while they may stress interagency linkages in a local area, they do not involve interstate coordination.

# V. PROJECT OUTCOMES

This chapter describes the products and dissemination strategies associated with the Section 143 Interstate and Intrastate Migrant Coordination Program. We obtained information on these project outcomes from telephone interviews and the examination of Section 143 products.[7] The products we examined included those that ED collected and others sent to us by respondents in our telephone survey.

Major findings concerning products and dissemination include the following:

- Most projects result in information, products, or experiences that can be shared.
- Products and final reports of projects are widely disseminated to the state level.
- Local level migrant educators have little knowledge of Section 143 projects or their outcomes unless their SEA is the grantee or a heavily involved cooperating state.

## Products

Most, but not all, Section 143 projects produce tangible products. The types of products developed by 32 grants are presented in Table V-1, which shows the direct relationship between the activities described in Chapter IV and the outcomes associated with these activities. Many projects, particularly those with multiyear funding, have produced several kinds of products.

---

[7] Appendix B contains product and dissemination profiles of 34 projects. Each profile is based on information garnered from a variety of sources. It is likely that many of the profiles are incomplete. We believe, however, that they accurately illustrate the outcomes of over half (64 percent) of the discrete projects funded between 1981 and 1986. Projects still receiving federal support, of course, will likely add to their outcomes in the current year.

Table V-1

Types of Products Developed
By Section 143 Inter/Intrastate Coordination Projects
FYs 1981-85
(n = 32)

| Product Type | No. of Projects |
|---|---|
| Curriculum guides/materials | 17 |
| Training/training packages | 15 |
| Newsletters | 9 |
| Brochures/pamphlets | 9 |
| Resource guides/directories | 7 |
| Other | 8 |

There is some variability in the curriculum products projects developed. Some projects produced materials for direct use with students, such as expendable workbooks or worksheets that can be duplicated. The most common curricular products, however, were teachers' guides or manuals, activity outlines, learning strategies, and supplementary resources for use with elementary and secondary school migrant children. One project developed postsecondary undergraduate and graduate level correspondence courses for the preparation of teachers and aides for migrant classrooms.

Because there is such a heavy emphasis on training activities in the Section 143 program, we have included the provision of workshops, technical assistance, and training sessions as a product category. Many projects develop training materials, modules, or packets as "hard copy" supplements to the in-person training they provide.

Newsletters are also a common product of Section 143 grants and of migrant education generally. In fact, a survey conducted by Louisiana's MENDIC (estimated date 1983) found 58 extant migrant

education newsletters around the nation. MENDIC's own newsletter, MEMO, is probably the most consistently published and widely disseminated effort in this area. First funded under Section 143 in 1982, MENDIC also received grants in 1984 and 1986. In the intervening years, the Louisiana SEA supported the publication of MEMO, which is printed in a small magazine format. MEMO covers national and stream migrant education news and, according to our interviews, is widely read.

Other newsletters are briefer and more narrowly focused. For example, migrant educators can receive (usually quarterly) publications on secondary credit exchange, special education, career education, and use of the MSRTS reading and math skills checklists. Although feature articles differ depending on a newsletter's central theme, duplicate coverage of conferences and meetings occurs across publications.

Many projects also produce brochures or pamphlets. Generally speaking, these are of two types. The first includes references for particular segments of the migrant population. For example, several career education projects develop brochures for students on various career clusters or opportunities. New York's Interstate Migrant Secondary School Project and its California offshoot (Western Secondary Team Project) offer a checklist in a brochure format for students to use when enrolling or withdrawing from a school. The other type of brochures or pamphlets describes the services or materials available through a given project.

The fifth major product category consists of resource guides and directories. Migrant families and migrant educators have a particular need for information about educational and health services in many

geographic areas. A number of projects, therefore, have devoted some portion of their energies and resources to developing compendia that are national, stream, or state-oriented. Examples of topics that have been treated in this way include scholarships; print, audio, and video educational resources; health and social services; and special education. Resource guides or directories have been the principal products of projects such as Florida's Dropout Model, New York's CHOICE (career education) and ESCAPE (child abuse), or Pennsylvania's MERLIN.

Some types of products on which we obtained information were unique to one or two projects. All projects must submit a final report to ED. For one project in our sample and probably two or three others over the history of the program, the final report is really the single major outcome of a project's activities. The HEP/CAMP evaluation project in California developed a model and validated it using 1983-84 student data. The results of this exercise, as written up and disseminated, are its product. New York's Migrant National Pilot Study, which conducted surveys, developed a list of reliable and valid norm-referenced tests, and suggested a format for a reporting system on MSRTS, also falls in this category. Projects with research or survey work as one of several activities are likely to produce reports too; we have not included these in Table IV-1 if a project had other types of outcomes.

Other infrequent types of products identified in the sample include a widely used identification and recruitment form, resource bibliographies, and basic skills checklists.

Projects with No Products

One issue we sought to address through interviews concerned projects with no discernible outcomes. A problem of definition quickly arose, however. As we discussed above, a few projects are not product-oriented except in the sense of analyzing and reporting on an issue or developing an evaluation design. Similarly, many projects have a training orientation and their principal outcomes are the workshops and sessions they run. We have chosen to include these as a product category even though a strict definition of "products" as tangibles might exclude them.

Our sample did include two projects that, to the best of our knowledge, were never completed—Michigan's employability project and Wisconsin's item bank. Both were single year awards in the early years of the program. Because of personnel changes and a six month delay in the project's start-up date, the Michigan SEA ultimately chose to return its award to the federal government. The Wisconsin project was unable to complete its planned activities in a single year and did not receive anticipated second year funding.

Although it was not in our sample and we therefore did not attempt to contact the project director, it is our understanding that Maine's 1981 project to determine the feasibility of national evaluation of migrant students also was not completed.

An inability to complete planned activities within a project year is not uncommon in the Section 143 program. If a project is likely to receive continuation funding, uncompleted work may be written into the new application. Eight projects in our sample had at one time or another requested and been granted a 90-day no-cost extension.

The primary reasons given for needing a time extension were a late start-up date due to personnel changes or delays in funding.

Dissemination

Selection criteria for Section 143 grants do not specifically require a dissemination plan. However, adequate dissemination is mentioned in the regulations in the context of applicants documenting coordination with participating states and local educational agencies.

Dissemination strategies. For the projects in our sample, we found that dissemination strategies fell into five principal categories:

- communication with cooperating states
- national mailings to all state directors/coordinators of migrant education
- presentations at conferences
- workshops
- newsletters

When a project's design includes several cooperating states, the fullest sharing of information and results is usually with those states. Depending on the intensity of the cooperating relationship, project directors may communicate with assigned SEA staff in other states regularly or intermittently throughout a project's life.

Among those projects with actual hands-on products or reports of general interest, many distributed at least one copy to each state director of migrant education. This practice has become a tradition in the Section 143 program. Some programs, because of the expense involved, restricted their dissemination of sample products to

cooperating states and subsequently made the products available at cost to all interested parties.

A large number of projects make presentations about their activities and products at the many migrant education conferences that take place throughout the year. At the NASDME conventions, the various stream meetings, and state migrant education conferences, Section 143 project directors and their staffs describe their activities and interim or final results, distribute any free materials, and generate mailing lists. Attendees at national and stream conferences tend to be principally state level migrant educators. State conventions, on the other hand, bring together staff representatives from local level migrant education sites. Potentially, then, conference presentations allow the Section 143 projects to reach significant numbers of state and local level migrant education administrators and teachers.

Projects whose main thrust is training often cite the workshops and training sessions that they sponsor as their main means of dissemination. The locations of and attendance at workshops are usually included in final reports to ED as evidence of a project's efforts to make its approach and expertise available to a large audience.

Newsletters, one of the principal products of several Section 143 grants, are also a major means of information dissemination about project results and products. The Louisiana MENDIC project's MEMO has been particularly comprehensive in providing updates and full feature reports on many of the interstate coordination projects. Its large circulation ensures widespread dissemination of basic information

about the grants, including contact names, addresses, and phone numbers where appropriate. Other newsletters, smaller in scope and circulation, are also dissemination vehicles for the projects they represent.

There are a limited number of more unique dissemination strategies employed by individual projects. New York's Computer Assisted Program for Reading/Math (CAPR/M), for example, maintains a WATS telephone line allowing frequent technical assistance calls anywhere in the country. The CAPR/M skills lists are now a part of MSRTS and are thus considered nationally disseminated. Pennsylvania's Migrant Education Resource List Information Network Clearinghouse (MERLIN) maintains an 800 number allowing cost free access to its data base of over 1,000 resources in migrant education. However, this service is seriously underutilized, logging only 42 phone requests in 1985.

The three 15-minute videotape segments produced by Pennsylvania's "Mr. Rogers" project were awarded one of 10 gold medals at the 1986 International Film and Television Festival in New York City. This recognition, the personal fame of the tapes' star, and the fact that master tapes have been distributed to each state (with extra copies to the large "sending" states of Florida, Texas, and California) virtually guarantee wide dissemination and use for this particular project.

A few projects disseminate products, materials, or information directly to target groups such as parents or secondary level students. DISNET, for example, puts its newsletter directly into the hands of migrant families passing through Hope, Arkansas. The California Western Secondary Project has a student newsletter. New York's Step

Beyond project mails books and educational materials collected from publishers directly to migrant families in its seven cooperating states.

Indicators of Product and Dissemination Effectiveness

In interviews with 21 state directors of migrant education and 20 local migrant educators, we sought information about the Section 143 projects and/or products that (1) most readily came to mind and (2) were considered most useful or effective. Interviewees were not prompted on these questions. Their responses, therefore, probably represent the projects or products with the highest profiles.

State responses. Table V-2 below shows the projects or products with which our sample of state directors were most familiar and their votes for best products. Interviewees were not restricted to a single best choice nomination. The results of this tabulation by no means represent an evaluation of project effectiveness or product quality; that was not our intent. The table should be viewed cautiously as an indicator of successful dissemination. Seven other projects received a single mention. A total of 22 projects were identified by the 21 interviewees.

One state director commented that in his opinion, New York and Pennsylvania had proven to be the most successful and conscientious grantees in terms of following through on their commitments. As we discussed earlier, these two states have held a large number of grants in relation to the number of migrant students that they serve directly. However, they apparently have the staff and organizational structure to prepare strong applications and implement activities effectively on behalf of states serving more migrant children.

Table V-2

Section 143 Projects and Products
Named By State Directors of Migrant Education

| Title* | No. of Times Identified | No. of Best Product Votes |
|---|---|---|
| MS: Curriculum guides | 10 | 10 |
| LA: MEMO | 6 | 6 |
| PA: HAPPIER | 6 | 6 |
| NY: IMSSP | 4 | 4 |
| PA: MERLIN | 4 | 3 |
| NY: CHOICE | 3 | 3 |
| NY: CAPR/M | 3 | 3 |
| CA: Western Secondary Project | 3 | 3 |
| PA: TEACH | 3 | 2 |
| IN: Parent network | 3 | 1 |
| PA: Mr. Rogers | 2 | 2 |
| NY: ESCAPE | 2 | 2 |
| IN: MERIT | 2 | 2 |
| NJ: MAP-S | 2 | 2 |
| AR: DISNET | 2 | 2 |

*The reader is referred to Table III-5 for full names of grants identified by acronyms in this table.

State directors' judgments about best products seemed to be based on factors related to both utility and quality. Except in the cases of MEMO (a product of Louisiana's MENDIC project) and the "Color Your Classroom" curriculum guides produced by the Mississippi Materials Resource Center, identification was at the project rather than the product level. Respondents spoke of the overall effectiveness of IMSSP or TEACH, for example, not individual products or specific outcomes.

Local level familiarity with projects and products. We contacted 20 migrant educators in local school districts concerning their knowledge about and use of Section 143 projects and products. In general, we found knowledge about the outcomes of Section 143 projects

to be very sketchy at the service delivery level. This does not necessarily mean that the results of Section 143 grants are not being utilized. In terms of tracking the grants' utility and value, the problem lies in the fact that most products are disseminated to the states, who in turn duplicate them and pass them on. Often, the original sources of materials or ideas are unknown, or at least unemphasized, at the local level.

Based on our sample, LEAs are most familiar with a project or projects in which their SEA is either the grantee or actively involved as a cooperating state. Beyond this, we found a limited number of projects that could be readily identified by local educators. Table V-3 represents Section 143 projects spontaneously mentioned by two or more representatives of LEAs. In addition to the 12 projects mentioned more than once, 14 other Section 143 projects were identified by LEAs.

Where local educators could identify the sources of materials that they actually used, only five Section 143 projects were mentioned

Table V-3

Section 143 Projects Most Frequently Named
By a Sample of LEAs

| Project Title | No. of Times Named |
|---|---|
| PA: TEACH | 4 |
| PA: MERLIN | 4 |
| IN: Parent network | 3 |
| MD, FL: Dropout project | 3 |
| LA: MEMO | 3 |
| NY: IMSSP | 2 |
| PA: HAPPIER | 2 |
| PA: Mr. Rogers | 2 |
| MS: Materials Resource Center | 2 |
| NJ: MAP-S | 2 |
| AR: DISNET | 2 |
| KS: PRIME | 2 |

more than once. They are: New Jersey's MAP-S project (career education), Pennsylvania's TEACH (environmental education), Georgia's staff development materials, Mississippi's "Color Your Classroom" curriculum guides, and Louisiana's MEMO. No project was mentioned more than three times. Several respondents noted that their SEAs often sent them sample materials, but they did not necessarily know who developed them.

Valid tracking of the dissemination of Section 143 projects and products to the local level would be a formidable task. Based on our interviews, LEAs believe that inter/intrastate coordination has improved over the past five or six years. They have not, however, made any direct link between this impression and the Section 143 grants program. Their principal definition of inter/intrastate coordination efforts involves direct contact with sending districts in the major migrant population states or required participation in cooperative efforts that they associate with their SEA. These latter initiatives may or may not be under the auspices of a Section 143 grant; the LEAs most frequently do not know.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

Based on the background information sources we examined and the interviews we conducted, we draw the following conclusions about the Section 143 grants program in particular and inter/intrastate coordination in migrant education in general:

- Perhaps the biggest issue facing the Section 143 program—whether through contracts or grants—is clear definition of its purpose. At present, little distinction is made between needs in migrant education and interstate coordination needs in migrant education.
- The Section 143 grants program has at least partially addressed areas described as continuing priorities in migrant education: secondary services/dropout prevention, staff development, parent involvement, national assessments.
- Projects have successfully disseminated products and other project results to SEAs but have largely failed to reach LEAs and classrooms.
- Broader dissemination might be facilitated by designating a central repository or clearinghouse through which Section 143-supported products and reports could be reaily obtained.
- An unknown but probably substantial amount of inter/intrastate coordination goes on quietly and unrecognized on a person-to-person or school district-to-school district basis.

Each of these summary statements is discussed in this chapter.

### Definition of Inter/intrastate Coordination Needs

Based on what we have learned in this study, the central issue for the future in the Section 143 program is its purpose. From the outset of federal involvement with migrant education, Congress has been impressed with the need for coordination among and within states. This makes a priori sense since the special experiences of migrant students involve the interruption of their education as they move from place to place.

There has never been a thorough and coordinated analysis of what the specific goals of inter/intrastate coordination should be. In a general way, state migrant educators see the overarching purpose of the Section 143 program to be the establishment and maintenance of a structure for promoting communication among states and with the federal Migrant Education Program. The specific needs or priorities addressed by grants in any given year are secondary to this primary raison d'etre. Beyond that, the states believe that congressional support for the program constitutes important leverage in a continuing struggle to make migrant education's special needs understood by the Executive Branch.

Even with that leverage, state directors feel that ED is not sufficiently attentive to state input regarding needs and priorities. This is in part the result of some confusion and disagreement about leadership in migrant education. The statutory and regulatory history of the program suggests that Congress, OE/ED, and the states have never entirely ironed out their differing ideas about lines of responsibility.

The states individually and the National Association of State Directors of Migrant Education (NASDME) have kept the federal Migrant Education Program apprised of current program issues. However, in the context of a relatively small discretionary grants program with a distinct theme, there are some problems with the issues that they consistently raise. Three problem areas that we believe should be addressed in long-range planning for the program are described below.

Lack of focus on coordination problems. Many of the issues and needs in migrant education that the Section 143 grants have targeted

are rooted in the problems of migrant education and migrant students generally, not necessarily in problems related to coordination in migrant education.

The heavy emphasis on career education in Section 143 grants is a good example of this point. The career education projects can be described most accurately as models. They develop and demonstrate strategies and curricula for exposing students to career options and opportunities by bringing in speakers, making site visits, and arranging internships or college visits. While career education programs provide a needed broadening of the migrant student's world, it is not clear how they qualify as coordination efforts. Mastery of career skills or documentation of raised career expectations are not items that are likely to be added to the MSRTS. Exposure to high tech career opportunities in a receiving state may not even translate well to realistic options in the sending state, where a currently migratory adolescent will most probably receive his or her high school diploma.

Systemic problems. Other problems that the Section 143 program has attempted to address appear to be so seriously systemic in nature that they require a far more concerted effort to find a solution than a discretionary grants program can provide. Again the career education focus is a case in point. The principal goal of the career programs, as we understand it, is to promote access because children of the migrant culture have not had and do not know that they could have access to a different life style via education and training. If, as we have heard on more than one occasion, currently migratory high school students are typically excluded from vocational education because of late enrollments, then the problem is indeed a broad,

systemic one. Career education curricula are neither a reasonable substitute for the exclusion nor an effective remedy for the situation.

The current federal vocational education legislation (P.L. 98-524) specifically names the disadvantaged, bilingual and limited English proficient persons, the handicapped, and women as target populations needing special assistance to gain fair access to vocational education and training. Although technically speaking, virtually every migrant student falls into one or more of these targeted groups, it may be that the migrant population needs to be specifically named under the Perkins Act in order to assure their full participation in vocational training.

Uniqueness of problems to migrant students. In some cases, we believe that the issues and problems addressed by the Section 143 grants are actually applicable to more broadly defined populations. Many migrant children are obviously also disadvantaged, limited English proficient, or handicapped. There are also, however, less obvious parallels with other groups.

There is probably no Section 143 project that is more truly an interstate effort addressing a truly interstate problem than New York's Interstate Migrant Secondary School Project. States and local school districts certainly do not share common interpretations of credit hours or course content, and this poses an irritating problem for students and their families. It is not, however, a problem exclusively restricted to the migrant population.

Many secondary students who attempt to graduate from high school after completing secondary courses in two or more school systems (or worse yet, states) experience credit transfer problems. In addition

to migrant children, others who regularly face educational disruptions are the children of military personnel and of unemployed blue collar workers seeking jobs. Smoothing the transition for less organizationally sophisticated populations who move frequently is an obvious and appropriate exercise in inter/intrastate coordination, particularly if a language barrier exacerbates the problem. Coordination strategies effective with migrant students would be equally appropriate for use with the children of industrial laborers moving from the rust belt to the sun belt (and often back again). They, too, are migratory and in many cases undoubtedly suffer from the displacement anxieties, loss of credits, and social embarassments that lead to dropping out.

We suggest that migrant educators should consider ways in which their own efforts and those of educators concerned with other subgroups of students might overlap and/or complement each other.

Relationship of Identified Migrant Education Needs to Section 143 Project Outcomes

When migrant educators are asked about past and future needs in migrant education, they tend to cite the same areas for both timeframes: secondary services/dropout prevention, staff development, parent involvement, national evaluations or assessments, early childhood education. They also overwhelmingly agree that the efforts under the Section 143 inter/intrastate coordination grants program have helped in meeting those needs. The implication is that in its six years of operation, Section 143 has provided a partial solution to some continuing problems in migrant education.

Whether or not the program has addressed inter/intrastate coordination needs, the majority of state level migrant education administrators

appears to agree that the grants program has produced prototypes, models, materials, and systems that have enhanced the delivery of effective migrant education. Two state directors did volunteer the opinion that perhaps a saturation point had been reached on "how to" manuals and "products." We tend to agree with this perspective, particularly in certain areas such as career education and national information centers where there appear to be duplications of effort.

Most states seem to believe that the current structures for needs assessment and evaluation are adequate and ensure a proper flow of information from localities to regions (where applicable) to SEAs and their national and stream organizations and thence on to the federal migrant program. Local educators confirmed that this was the pattern and agreed that it was appropriate. As noted previously, some state directors assert that the federal Migrant Education Program and/or higher administrative levels in the Education Department have been less and less responsive to needs the states have reported. Resolving this debate may require a change in the Section 143 regulations that institutionalizes the procedures for identification of priority areas.

Dissemination of Outcomes

We found that a tradition has grown up in the Section 143 grants program whereby most products and other types of outcomes are routinely disseminated to state directors of migrant education (including the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico). The burden then falls on the state administrative structure to apprise local migrant education programs of new products or services. According to local program people, this either does not happen or, when it does, they cannot

necessarily identify the original source of the materials or information.

A few state administrators object to the dissemination responsibilities placed on the states. In their view, individual projects should budget for dissemination at least to the regional level, especially in the larger sending states. Other state administrators welcome the opportunity to review the disseminated information and materials before recommending them for further dissemination at their state migrant education meetings or workshops.

In our attempt to review products of Section 143 grants, we were surprised to find that there is no central location where all products or other types of outcome information, such as final reports and results of surveys or evaluations, are collected. Nor, apparently, is there any person who, like a librarian, can serve as a reference source for individuals seeking additional information about a particular topic related to inter/intrastate coordination.

Given the amount of federal dollars invested in the program over a six year period, it would seem a wise investment to establish a repository and perhaps a dissemination center to ensure continued availability and use of program results.

Locally Based Efforts at Interstate Coordination

Primarily because of our current involvement with another study of migrant education programs funded under the basic migrant education entitlement (Section 141 of Chapter 1), we have become increasingly aware that considerable routine inter/intrastate coordination occurs on a regular basis. It is not uncommon for local migrant projects in

receiving states to communicate directly with the home communities in sending states. In some cases, exchange visits are made.

This type of activity probably originated with the Texas-Washington secondary credit exchange, an effort that predates the Section 143 grants program. New York's Interstate Migrant Secondary Services Projects and its more recently funded offshoot the Western Secondary Stream Project refined and extended the credit exchange idea. At present, there are apparently numerous small, specific linkages established on a person-to-person or school district-to-school district basis that cannot be directly attributed to any specific state or national initiatives for interstate coordination. Rather, they represent strategies that make sense to local educators and are supported out of their Section 141 entitlements.

This is an unmeasured and largely unknown phenomenon as far as we can tell and warrants further investigation. We believe that it is highly likely that these efforts could yield some very excellent "models" of interstate coordination.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY


Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives. "Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965." Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, February 1979.

Exotech Systems, Inc. "The Evaluation of the Impact of ESEA Title I Programs for Migrant Children of Migrant Agricultural Workers." Falls Church, VA: Author, 1974.

National Education Association. "Migrant Education: The Politics of Building an Education System." Washington, DC: NEA, December 1981. ERIC document ED 212 453.

National Education Association. "Education for Mobile Populations in America: A Rationale for the Office of Migrant Education, U.S. Department of Education." Washington, DC: NEA, March 1981. ERIC document ED 212 451.

Stockburger, Cassandra. "The Impact of Interstate Programs on Continuity in Migrant Education." University Park, NM: ERIC Clearinghouse on Rural Education and Small Schools, February 1980. ERIC document ED 184 783.

Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives. Hearing on H.R. 15 to extend for five years certain elementary, secondary, and other education programs. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1977.

Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, U.S. Senate. "The Migratory Farm Labor Problem in the United States." Report No. 91-83. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1969.

Subcommittee on Agricultural Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives. Hearings held in Washington, DC, November 11 and December 5, 1975. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1976.

## APPENDIX A

Outline of Topics Covered in
Telephone Interviews

OUTLINE OF TOPICS COVERED IN TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS

1. How do states and local educational agencies determine their interstate/intrastate coordination needs?

2. How do state and local interstate/intrastate coordination needs get communicated to the U.S. Department of Education and what is the relationship of state and local needs to Section 143 priority areas?

3. What are the goals and activities of Section 143 projects? Who benefits, both directly and indirectly, from project activities? How do Section 143 coordination activities differ from coordination efforts required under Section 141?

4. In projects that have received more than one year of funding, what is the continuation grant's relationship to the goals, activities, and products originally proposed?

5. What kinds of products or models have been developed under Section 143 grants? Which products, models, or activities stand out as particularly useful or successful?

6. How do the products, models, and activities relate to identified interstate/intrastate coordination needs?

7. What dissemination strategies are used both during and after the grant period? How could dissemination be improved?

8. What role do cooperating states play in 143 grants and does this vary significantly depending on project goals and activities?

# APPENDIX B

## Product and Dissemination Profiles of 34 Section 143 Interstate and Intrastate Coordination Projects

## Index of Profiles


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| AR: | Project DISNET and Improving Dissemination Practices... | B-3 |
| CA: | HEP/CAMP Evaluation..... | B-5 |
| CA: | Western Secondary (IMSTP)..... | B-6 |
| CA: | Western Stream..... | B-9 |
| FL/MD: | Migrant Dropout Model..... | B-11 |
| GA: | Staff Development Services..... | B-13 |
| IN: | Career Awareness (SECAP)..... | B-16 |
| IN: | Migrant Parent Network (MPN)..... | B-18 |
| KS: | PRIME (Pre-School Readiness in Migrant Education)..... | B-20 |
| LA: | Career Awareness: Children of the Road..... | B-21 |
| LA: | MENDIC (National Dissemination & Information Center)... | B-23 |
| MS: | National Materials and Resource Center..... | B-26 |
| NJ: | Career Education Needs Assessment Model..... | B-28 |
| NY: | Bilingual Teacher Training..... | B-30 |
| NY: | CAPR/CAPM (Computer Assisted Programs Reading/Math).... | B-32 |
| NY: | CHOICE (Career Education)..... | B-34 |
| NY: | ESCAPE (Child Abuse Prevention & Education)..... | B-36 |
| NY: | IMSSP (Interstate Migrant Secondary Services Program).. | B-38 |
| NY: | MENTOR (Migrant Educators' National Training Outreach). | B-41 |
| NY: | National Pilot Study..... | B-43 |
| NY/MN: | Special Education Center..... | B-45 |
| NY: | Step Beyond..... | B-48 |
| OR: | Experienced-Based Career Education..... | B-50 |
| OR: | Special Education..... | B-53 |
| PA: | CARE (Community Awareness and Resource Efforts)..... | B-55 |
| PA: | HAPPIER (Health Awareness)..... | B-56 |
| PA: | MERLIN (Resource List and Information Network)..... | B-58 |
| PA: | Mr. Rogers..... | B-60 |
| PA: | TEACH (Teaching Environmental Awareness to Children)... | B-62 |
| VA: | Modality Education/Learning Alternative Resource Center | B-63 |
| WA: | IBI (Individualized Bilingual Instruction)..... | B-64 |

| | |
|---|---|
| Project Title: | Project DISNET (In 1981 only: Improving Dissemination Practices and Techniques Utilizing Intrastate and Interstate Networks) |
| Funding Years: | 1981, 1984-85 (Note: the 1981 grant formed the foundation for the latter project) |
| Grantee: | Arkansas Department of Education |
| Address: | Howard County Board of Education<br>Nashville, Arkansas |
| Telephone: | (501)845-3220 |
| Contacts: | Homer Neal, Project Director<br>Dwight D. Jones, Project Coordinator |

Description of Products

(1) Needs assessment conducted in spring 1983 in Hope, AR.

(2) Newsletter "DISNET News" printed in English and Spanish, contains news about education in Arkansas.

Dissemination Information

(1) Each cooperating state established a dissemination network for gathering and sending out information. Networks included newspapers, radio, telephone calls, SEA and LEA publications. The SEAs published a monthly newsletter that was disseminated at Hope.

(2) January 10, 1985 a training session was held in McAllen, TX for DISNET council members. A total of 363 people were in attendance:

| | DISNET Mbrs. | SEA Staff | LEA Staff |
|---|---|---|---|
| Orientation | 8 | 63 | 218 |
| Training | 12 | 19 | 143 |
| Totals | 20 | 82 | 261 |

(3) Between January-August, 1985 a total of 37 "transactions" were made between the 7 cooperating states. A transaction is defined by the grantee as "logging and disseminating information" (maintaining a description of the information gathered and sent out). This was an average of 4.6

transactions per month (5 transactions per state). The grantees' goal was 2 transactions per month per state. Between August-December 1985, a total of 315 transactions were made by the seven cooperating states.

(4) "Population Served": 9,393 students and their families from south Texas who traveled to Hope, AR, IL, IN, MI, OH, and WI. A cost of $7.76/student.

NOTE: This dissemination information was obtained from the project's FY 1984-85 Evaluation Report dated 8/31/85.

Project Title: Evaluation Model for the High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP)

Funding Year: 1984

Grantee: California State Dept. of Education

Address: California State University
Joyal Administration Building
Fresno, CA 93740

Telephone: (209)294-4768

Contact: Raul Z. Diaz, Project Coordinator
Dr. Gary Riley, Project Director

Description of Product

*(1) Four-part final report:

- "A Program Evaluation Model for Migrant Higher Education", November 1985, 50 pp.
- Research Report No. 1 "A National Overview of Staff and Program Characteristics 1984-85", 24 pp.
- Research Report No. 2 "Overview of Student Characteristics and Program Outcomes", 29 pp.
- Research Report No. 3 "A Comprehensive Analysis of HEP/CAMP Program Participation", 90 pp.

Dissemination of Product

(1) Articles in the January and March 1986 issues of MEMO.

(2) Presentation of study findings at the Fall 1985 HEP/CAMP conference, San Antonio, Texas.

(3) Presentation of study findings at the December, 1985 NASDME meeting.

Project Title: Interstate Migrant Secondary Team Project (IMSTP)
(Western Secondary Project)

Funding Years: 1985, 1986

Grantee: California State Department of Education

Address: 2802 Juan Street, #28
San Diego, California 92110

Telephone: (619)295-1313

Contact: Susan C. Morse, Project Coordinator

Description of Products

*(1) "Needs Assessment Summary", 5 pages, December 1985. Developed by IMSTP team members during a training session. Lists 18 content areas for secondary advocacy and possible solutions for each area. Areas include: basic skills, language acquisition/ESL, dropout prevention, credit accrual, needs assessment and program planning, program structures/strategies, junior high services, dropout retrieval and alternative educational options, counseling, student self-advocacy, postsecondary school options, supplemental educational services (in school), community resources, parent education, supplemental educational programs (out of school), career education/work experience, interstate coordination, and advocacy.

*(2) "Student Talk Page", 4 pp, monthly student newsletter written in English and Spanish. Topic areas include: study skills, applying for college, student's writing/art is also featured. (The student newsletter was added in FY 1986, previously the newsletter was only for migrant educators.)

*(3) "Dropout"-A Bibliography, 4 pp. provides a current listing of publications related to migrant dropouts.

(4) Team training for state level migrant personnel. The project paid expenses for one person per state (of the 13 cooperating states), a state could send additional personnel for training at their own cost. Each training program lasts three days. The focus of the training is secondary migrant program improvement. The same group of people are trained at these sessions, it is the projects' goal to have these people become trainers within their own states as a means of institutionalizing the concept of the project.

Major topics covered include: communication skills, prevention of dropout and recovery, presentations by team members (to practice communication skills), peer tutoring, parent information, retention rates and their effects on dropouts.

(5) A resource center of secondary materials is maintained on site by the project director, copies of the materials will be made upon request.

*(6) "A Directory of Scholarships and Financial Assistance available to Migrant High School Graduates" , spiral bound, 33 pp., content includes: different types of financial assistance, how to apply for financial aid, college costs, examples of scholarships awarded to migrant students in Arizona. The directory lists financial assistance under seven categories: migrant, Hispanic, disadvantaged, federal, health related fields, minority in specific fields of study, and specific field of study. (Up-dated and expanded version of a NY IMSSP product).

(7) Individual state training sessions are also held on topics relating to secondary issues. In 1985, OR, TX, WA requested additional training.

Dissemination Information

(1) During FY 1985-86:

- Four team training sessions were held for the 13 cooperating states, an average of 22 people were in attendance at each session (one person from each state plus additional California regional staff).

- Approximately 800-1,000 people received training (this includes regular and team training).

- Six issues of the staff newsletter were distributed, 900 copies per issue.

- 150 Scholarship Directories were disseminated.

- 25 Dropout Bibliographies were disseminated.

- A total of 1,200 resource materials were disseminated.

(2) September-December 20, 1986:

- A total of 227 people have been trained in 17 different training: these sessions included one of four team training planned for this FY, and a minicon-ference on dropouts held in San Diego in mid-December. One training session is planned for the California regional staff.

- Two issues of the newsletter have been sent: October issue-1,200 distributed; December issue-1,500 distributed.

- 67 Scholarship Directories have been mailed.

- 15 Dropout Bibliographies have been mailed.

- A total of 552 resource materials have been requested and disseminated.

Project Title: Western Migrant Stream Program Improvement Project

Funding Years: 1985, 1986

Grantee: California State Department of Education

Address: 2120-A Robinson Street
Oroville, CA 95965

Telephone: (916)534-4267/4208

Contact: Mary Lee Seward, Project Director

Description of Product

(1) Established Migrant Education Program Improvement Centers (MEPICs) in California (13) and in the cooperating states of Idaho, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, Oregon, Texas, and Washington. The project provides a model to interested personnel on how to set up a center, collect and disseminate materials. Each MEPIC individualizes to meet its' users (migrant educators) needs. Program training can also be arranged on site.

The main California MEPIC (Butte County) has a collection of over 450 educational programs that can be used with migrant students. The programs are primarily developed by school districts and state education agencies from around the country, all programs are noncommercially developed. Thirty-one of these programs (in addition to other 143 programs) are used as the basis to set up a MEPIC. Only "active" programs are used, the project is not a material depository.

*(2) "Curriculum Resource Center--Descriptions of Programs and Materials", 226 pages, revised January, 1986. Lists the over 450 Butte Center programs by 18 subject areas. For each program, the appropriate grade level of instruction and the developer is listed, each program is assigned a project number for inventory purposes. The subject areas include:

-Affective education/counseling/guidance
-Bilingual/multicultural/ESL
-Career/Vocational education
-Computer and technology related programs
-Early childhood education
-Environmental education
-Fine arts
-Gifted and talented

-Language arts
-Mathematics/metrics
-Nutrition/health education
-Physical/movement education
-Reading
-Science
-Social science
-Special education
-Staff Development
-Additional subject bibliographies

*(3) 127 packets of lessons and units addressing all curriculum areas and grade levels are available from the Butte MEPIC at $.05 per page plus postage and handling fees. Lesson packets range in length from 20-108 pages. Listing updated October, 1986.

*(4) Spiral bound, 42 pages, computer listing of the programs listed in (2) above. Listings are broken down into the same 18 categories.

*(5) A quarterly MEPIC newsletter is published by Butte California MEPIC.

*(6) MEPIC flyer describes the program, lists the addresses and phone numbers of the California centers.

Dissemination Information

(1) All 143 project directors were contacted with information about MEPICs.

(2) An extensive mailing list is maintained of all users of the MEPIC and other migrant educators across the country.

Project Title: Migrant Dropout Model

Funding Years: 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986

Grantee: Florida Department of Education
(Fiscal agent: FL-1985-87
Fiscal agent: MD-1983-84)

Address: BOCES Migrant Center
Holcomb Building, Room 210
Geneseo, NY 14454

Telephone: (716)245-5681 or (800)245-5681

Contact: Dr. Gloria Mattera, Project Coordinator

Description of Product

NOTE: Since 1968, the BOCES Geneseo Migrant Center has provided a comprehensive program of educational, health care, and family services to migrant farmworkers. The 1983 and 1984 Section 143 grants allowed for an East Coast pilot program to serve dropouts.

(1) Four facilitators were placed along the East Coast to provide counseling and advocacy services.

(2) A resource center on migrant dropout youth was established.

(3) A network of role models for migrant youth was created.

The 1985 Section 143 grant expanded the dropout model to 14 states. Florida became the fiscal agent.

(4) A monthly bilingual newsletter Real Talk to dropouts was distributed.

(5) A toll-free hotline for information about dropout programs and careers was established.

(6) A model peer facilitator project for selected migrant youth to assist the facilitators in identifying and serving dropouts was begun.

(7) Technical assistance and staff development was provided in the areas of advocacy, awareness and implementation of the dropout model to migrant education programs and service agencies.

(8) Scholarship funds worth $7,500 were distributed to 52 youths from 10 states. Funds were used toward enrollment at various community colleges or four-year universities. Three students used the money to attend high schools. A few students were given cash awards for being "exemplary students".

(9) A "Career Clip Sheets" file was established. The one-page, bilingual sheets discuss a career (i.e. auto mechanic, food server). The sheets describe the education and training necessary for the career, job outlook and earnings, and where to seek additional information.

The 1986 Section 143 grant expanded the model to include 20 states. Florida remains the fiscal agent.

Dissemination Information

FY 1985:

(1) Nine presentations of the migrant dropout youth program were made. Audiences included: National HEP/CAMP Association, National Association of Educators of Young Children, Eastern Stream conference, Kansas State migrant conference, and Illinois State migrant conference.

(2) Seven workshop/training sessions were conducted. Sites included: Atlanta, GA; Vermont; Jefferson City, MO; Peoria, IL; Williamson, NY; Tampa, FL; Melbourne, FL.

(3) Files were maintained on 4,204 migrant youths. The characteristics of those youths are: 57 percent-male; 59 percent Hispanic, 19 percent white; 13 percent unknown ethnic background; 39 percent aged 17-18, 33 percent aged 19-20; 63 percent based in Florida, 16 percent based in New York, 9 percent based in Georgia.

(4) Nine issues (18,931 copies) of Real Talk mailed.

(5) Telephone contact made with 1,014 youths. Personal correspondence to 2,459 youths.

(6) 301 packets of materials distributed to interested individuals/agencies. (These packets were in addition to materials disseminated at the presentations and training sessions listed above).

Project Title: Staff Development Services

Funding Years: 1982, 1983, 1984

Grantee: Georgia State Department of Education

Address: Center for Public and Urban Research
Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA 30303

Telephone: (404)658-3523

Contact(s): John D. Studstill (1984-85)
Janet D. Ockerman-Garza (1983-84)

Description of Products

*(1) Information Manual for Parents, 24 pp. English and Spanish versions. ($3.50) Developed by Teryl Lundquist. Content:

— school services for migrant children

— 1984-85 school year calendar with important dates and events

— local resources list

— advice to parents

Training Packages

*(2) "Identifying Children with Learning Needs." Spiral bound notebook; 90 minute videotape available. (Manual, $10.00; $25.00 with VHS or Beta videotape; $45.00 with 3/4" videotape). Developed by Cristina Visparas, Curriculum Development Specialist. Content:

— describes individual learning handicaps, e.g., learning disabled, mentally retarded, visual and hearing impaired.

— attachments A-G provide intervention techniques, instructional strategies, lesson checklist, toys and games, references, professional and consumer organizations, instructional materials and sources.

*(3) "Mainstreaming Children with Learning Problems." Spiral bound notebook, 100 pp. ($10.00) Developed by Cristina Visparas, Curriculum Development Specialist. Content:

— 2 sections: administrative aspects of mainstreaming; instructional aspects of mainstreaming.

*(4) "Increasing Problem-Solving Skills." Spiral bound notebook, 50 pp. ($10.00) Developed by Cristina Visparas, Curriculum Development Specialist. Content:

— decision-making and problem-solving techniques.

— description of management-by-objectives.

— applying management-objectives to problem solving.

— application and exercises.

*(5) "Developing a Program of Action to Promote Program and Cultural Awareness." Spiral bound notebook, 65 pp. ($10.00) Developed by Cristina Visparas, Curriculum Development Specialist. Content:

— description of problem-solving model.

— proposed program of action and alternatives.

— group conversation: discussion starters, ice breakers.

— cultural and program awareness package, including: migration patterns, the migrant child, cultural diversity, references and other video resources.

*(6) "Federal Legislation and the Migratory Farmworker." Spiral bound notebook divided into five color-coded sections, 113 pp. ($15.00) Researched and developed by Susan H. Chin. Content:

— summary of major federal legislation pertaining to migrant farmworkers.

— discussion of the importance of foreign farmworkers, the status of undocumented workers, proposed immigration reform.

— review of recent court decisions and school laws; highlights of the Migrant Education Program.

— suggestions on where to take questions and complaints.

— list of staff development materials available through the project.

(7) Other publications:

— "Practical Activities to Develop Basic Reading Skills" ($3.50).

— "Support Services and the Migratory Farmworker" ($3.50).

— "Northwest Staff Development Needs Assessment: Final Report" ($10.00).

— "What is Migrant Education?" ($1.00)

(8) Sponsored Southeast regional staff development training conference. Atlanta, GA, 1983. over 50 participants. Purpose: develop "trainers" for six states. Topics: identification of children with learning problems; development of positive reinforcement models; individualizing instruction; administrative problem-solving; use of individualized plans for students; ESL and bilingual techniques; increasing classroom use of MSRTS information.

Dissemination Information

(1) All products (curriculum and training modules) originally distributed to SEAs of cooperating states. (1983 = 6 states; 1984 = 10 states; 1985 = 14 states)

(2) Training modules and other publications remain available at cost through the Center for Public and Urban Research, Georgia State University, University Plaza, Atlanta, GA 30303.

Project Title: Migrant Education Secondary Education Career Awareness (SECAP)

Funding Year: 1982

Grantee: Indiana Department of Public Instruction

Address: Room 229, State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Telephone: (317)232-6610

Contact(s):

Description of Products

*(1) Career Manual. Loose-leaf notebook, 65 pp. Produced by the Migrant Education Center, Ball State University, Muncie, IN. Content:

— description of program of one week residential career education sessions for secondary-level migrant youth. Career areas covered: business, industry, health, agriculture, computers. Enrollment for three of the seven weeks ranged from four to eight students.

(2) A questionnaire was developed to determine the career area to be implemented in SECAP and to begin recruitment procedures.

*(3) "Job Search Materials", 36 pp. loose-leaf papers stapled together, divided into 11 sections:

- Introduction: steps in job getting, pre-employment checklist, social security worksheet
- The Search: where to look, phone contacts
- Resume: references, writing a resume, two samples
- Applications: filling one out, samples
- Cover Letter: writing one, form, three samples, check list, follow-up calls
- Interview: pre-interview checklist, tips, typical questions, questions you can ask, sample follow-up letter
- Job Selection: making job decisions, accepting and rejecting offers

- Keeping the Job
- Terminating the Job
- Audiovisuals (relating to the job process)
- Bibliography

Dissemination Information

(1) The questionnaires were sent out in packets of five (in both English and Spanish): 14 Texas school districts and 4 Florida school districts received them.

(2) In October 1982 an adjustment to the project time table was made that included the following modifications:

**Proposed:** 4 week class, 4 week on-the-job-training
Modified: 2 week class, 3 week OJT

**Proposed:** offer 3 career areas
Modified: condense to 1 area

**Proposed:** serve no more than 30 migrant students
Modified: serve no more than 15 students
(Participant criteria: must be eligible for Chapter one services, student in grade 8-12 or, 15-20 years of age and have not completed high school).

Project Title: Migrant Parent Network (MPN)

Funding Years: 1981, 1982, 1984, 1985, 1986

Grantee: Indiana State Department of Education

Address: Room 229, State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204

Telephone: (317) 232-6610

Contact(s): David Hernandez, Project Coordinator
(Sarah Palmer, former Coordinator)

Description of Products

*(1) "Running on Empty." Slide-tape show (71 slides, script), 1982. Informational program for migrant parents.

*(2) "Texas-Indiana Parent Training Handbook." 1982, 111 pp. Content:

— general introduction.

— overview of the training model

— elaboration of the eight stages of the model: pre-entry; entry; design of workshop; field test; implementation of workshop; refinement; formative evaluation; summative evaluation.

— for each state, activities and "focusing question" presented

— annotated bibliography (140 ERIC citations)

(3) "Migrant Parent Education, Growth and Development: Birth to Adolescence". (Reference is made to this handbook in the FY 1984-85 Final Performance Report. There were no further details on the handbook or its' distribution.)

Dissemination Information

(1) Originally, project involved only Indiana and Texas. Expanded to three other receiving states (IL, MI, MN) in second year. Training had also been conducted in Arkansas and Kansas by November of 1984.

(2) During FY 1984-85 the following presentations were made:

— IN: State Directors' Workshop-March 1984
— MO: Central Stream Conference-October 1984
— LA: National Migrant Conference-April 1985
— IL: Seven state training in Chicago-April 1985

As a result of the Chicago training session, workshops were held in the five cooperating states during their peak migrant season. A total of 60 workshops were conducted with 2,442 parents being trained.

| State | # of Workshops | # Participants |
|---|---|---|
| IL | 6 | 245 |
| IN | 16 | 170 |
| MI | 23 | 1,452 |
| MN | 4 | 475 |
| WI | 11 | 100 |
| Totals: | 60 | 2,442 |

Project Title: PRIME (Pre-School Readiness in Migrant Education

Funding Year: 1985

Grantee: Kansas State Department of Education

Address: 120 East 10th Street
Topeka, KS 66612

Telephone: (913)296-3161

Contact: Shirley Scott, Project Director

Description of Products

(1) This project serves currently migrant children in a 5 day/week program. Eighty children are served in four public school sites in the southwest region of the state. Students are chosen on a first-come, first-serve basis; there is a waiting list.

(2) The project site staff receive training in the summer. The program emphasis is early intervention and consists of the following components:

- o oral language
- o ESL
- o nutrition
- o evaluation
- o parent involvement (home visits are required)

(3) Children are evaluated in English and their native language, with the Brigance Pre-School Screening Test. They attend the program daily from 8:30 a.m. to 2 p.m. and receive a hot lunch through the federal free lunch program.

Dissemination Information

(1) One site was originally planned, the response to the program in Kansas allowed for four sites. The project director made a presentation in Missouri on the program and has been in contact with Nebraska and Iowa.

(2) A manual was developed on how to set-up a similar program. The manual was disseminated to the cooperating states at the SEA level.

**Project Title:** Career Awareness Project: Children of the Road

**Funding Year:** 1982

**Grantee:** Louisiana State Department of Education

**Address:** P. o. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804

**Telephone:** (504)342-3517

**Contact(s):** Stanley Passman, Project Supervisor

Description of Products

*(1) Looseleaf notebook of curriculum activities/lesson plans, 190 pp. Published by Rapides Parish School Board, Alexandria, LA. ($3.00) Some teaching materials included; appropriate grade levels indicated. Four sections (color coded):

- Cultural Awareness
- Self-awareness
- Economic Awareness
- Vocational Awareness

*(2) Pamphlet: "Resource Guide to Career Education." Spiral bound, 13 pp. Describes instructional materials and inservice training opportunities for career education (grades K through secondary). Each entry gives the name of the materials, publisher, publication date, approximate cost, format, reading level, and the advantages/ disadvantages associated with use.

*(3) OPTIONS, Migrant Career Education Newsletter. Vol.I, No. 1, Spring 1983, 4 pp. Produced and printed by the project in cooperation with the Leflore County, MS school system, Greenwood, MS 38930. No indication of circulation or frequency of publication.

*(4) OPTIONS, Vol. I, No. 2, Fall 1983, 2 pp. Produced in cooperation with the Tangipahoa Parish School System. "Resource Guide to Career Education Instructional Materials", spiral bound, 144 pages, prepared by Shirley Holder, Frances Magee: Migrant education career awareness teachers for Tangipahoa Parish. Designed to be a "plug-in" component to regular or summer migrant education projects. For junior high grades 7-9.

There are two phases of the program: self-actualization and the fundamentals of career development. Each phase has a number of modules that can be used as mini courses. A set of suggested activities for each module is provided in this curriculum package. The 17 sections of this two-phase program are:

- Philosophy
- Objectives
- Assessment
- Personnel
- Record Keeping
- Resources
- Student Handbook
- Activity Instructions
- Tests
- Cultural Awareness
- Self Awareness
- Personal Hygiene
- Setting Goals
- Effective Study Habits
- Economic Awareness
- Vocational Awareness
- Evaluation

Dissemination Information

(1) No information available on dissemination of above products.

(2) Original consortium of states included LA, GA, MS, Mo, NC.

**Project Title:** Migrant Education National Dissemination & Information Center (MENDIC)

**Funding Years:** 1982, 1984, 1986

**Grantee:** Louisiana State Department of Education

**Address:** P.O. Box 44064
Baton Rouge, LA 70804

**Telephone:** (504) 342-3484 — MENDIC
(504) 342-4517 — Migrant Ed. Program

**Contact(s):** Al Wright, Project Coordinator
(Linda Wall, former Project Director)

Description of Product(s)

*(1) 7 issues of newsletter, MENDIC MESSAGES, March 1983-June 1984.

— Feature articles

— Conference reports

— National, state, and local migrant education news

*(2) Newsletter MEMO, November 1984-present. (Replaced MENDIC MESSAGES.)

— Feature articles

— Conference reports

— National, state, and local migrant education news

— Regular columns: Around These United States; Interstate Coordination; MSRTS; Commentary and Background.

*(3) "Migrant Education — Choices, Not Circumstances." 9 minute slide-tape program, English and Spanish versions. Completed 1983-84.

*(4) 9 news releases/public service announcements for use by states and localities, English and Spanish versions. Completed 1983-84.

*(5) Brochures: "The Migrant Student Record Transfer System" and "The Migrant Education Program — Help for America's Children," English and Spanish versions. Completed 1983-84.

*(6) Systematic Methodology for Accountability in Recruiter Training (SMART) Manual. Loose-leaf format, 75 pp. Completed May 1986.

o Six chapters

- Introduction: provides information on the Migrant Education Program.

- The Recruiter: discusses locating migrant children, making contact with families and employers, duties of a recruiter.

- Eligibility: gives eligibility criteria for currently and formerly migratory children.

- Interviewing for Accountability: describes family interviewing protocol

- Documentation: describes and discusses minimum eligibility data, additional eligibility information, model certificate of eligibility, how to obtain credible information, recording of information, retention of records.

- Monitoring for Accountability: provides sample monitoring instruments and discusses development of monitoring checklists.

- Appendix: statutes and regulations, sample certificate of eligibility, worksheet for determining eligibility.

(7) Information and Dissemination Skills Workshop, April, 1983. over 100 participants. Focus on ways of communicating with target audiences, media, and general public.

Dissemination Information

(1) MENDIC MESSAGES: distribution 5-8,000 copies, 1983-84.

(2) MEMO: distribution 9-10,000 copies, 1985-86.

(3) "Migrant Education — Choices, Not Circumstances": both language versions sent to all state directors, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico.

(4) News releases and public service announcements: sent to all state directors, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico.

(5) Brochures "The Migrant Student Record Transfer System" and "The Migrant Education Program — Help for America's Children:" both language versions sent to all state directors, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico. More than 90,000 copies distributed.

(6) Systematic Methodology for Accountability in Recruiter Training (SMART) Manual: 1,500 copies distributed to state directors, District of Columbia, Puerto Rico.

**Project Title:** National Materials and Resource Center

**Funding Years:** 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986

**Grantee:** Mississippi State Department of Education

**Address:** P.O. Box 220
Gulfport, MS 39502-0220

**Telephone:** (601)896-1211/1216

**Contact(s):** Teenie Barnett, Project Coordinator

Description of Products

*(1) "Color Your Classroom III: An oral Language Curriculum Guide." Yellow, softcover book, 1983, 140 pp. Content: lesson plans to improve verbal skills; listening comprehension, critical listening, oral expression, vocabulary development. Lessons include objectives, directions for teaching, activities, illustrations. Correlated with MSRTS oral Language Skills list.

*(2) "Color Your Classroom II: A Math Curriculum Guide." Green, softcover book, 1982, 138 pp. Content: math readiness, number meaning, whole numbers, fractions, decimals, percent, measurement, geometry, probability and statistics, sets. Correlated with MSRTS Mathematics Skills list.

*(3) "Color Your Classroom I: A Reading Curriculum Guide." Blue, softcover book, 1981, 142 pp. Content: reading readiness, consonants, vowels, structural analysis of words, literal meaning, inferential meaning, vocabulary, reading in the content areas. Correlated with MSRTS Reading Skills list.

*(4) "Color Your Classroom IV: A Reading Guide on the Secondary Level." Red, softcover book, 1984, 139 pp. Content: structural analysis, literal meanings, inferential meanings, vocabulary, reading in the content area. Correlated with MSRTS Reading Skills.

*(5) "Color Your Classroom V: A Math Guide on the Secondary Level." White, softcover book, 1985, 132pp. Content: whole numbers, fractions, decimals, percent, measurement, geometry, probability and statistics, sets. Correlated with MSRTS Math Skills.

(6) Workshop, January 31, 1984. Representatives from 11 states. Purpose: to train curriculum specialists to establish resource centers in their home states.

(7) Workshop, October 1984. Representatives from 14 states.

(8) Inservice programs, 1983-84: GA, NV, KS, PA.

Dissemination Information

(1) Each state director received two copies of "Color Your Classroom III. A total of 6,436 copies of this publication were disseminated nationally during FY 1984-85.

(2) Fall 1984, 4300 copies of "Color Your Classroom II distributed to 43 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

(3) During the first 3 years of operation, the Center hosted migrant administrators/staff from 46 states and Puerto Rico. Personnel participated in workshops to explain the creation and development of the Center and the techniques used.

Center staff visited 31 states and conducted workshops for more than 3,9000 teachers/staff in the construction of curriculum materials.

(4) During the fourth year of the project, four workshops were held in Gulfport, personnel from 25 states benefitted directly ( 2 curriculum specialists from each state attended). Seven other workshops were held in the following states: AL, CO, GA, MO, NY, PA, UT. A total of 388 participants attended the 11 workshops. Following is a list of the dates, location and number of participants at the workshops.

| DATE | LOCATIoN | # OF PARTICIPANTS |
|---|---|---|
| 10/4/84 | NY | 91 |
| 10/24-25/84 | MS | 9 |
| 10/29-30/84 | MO | ? (Central Stream Conference) |
| 11/14-15/84 | MS | 20 |
| 12/1/84 | PA | 45 |
| 3/27-28/85 | MS | 8 |
| 5/1-4/85 | GA | 62 (Nat. Conf.) |
| 5/11/85 | UT | 56 (state workshop) |
| 5/22-24/85 | MS | 2 |
| 6/5/85 | AL | 30 |
| 6/10-12/85 | CO | 65 (state workshop) |

Project Title: Secondary School Career Education Needs Assessment Model for Migratory Students

Funding Years: 1981, 1982

Grantee: New Jersey State Department of Education

Address: 225 West State Street
Trenton, New Jersey 08625

Telephone: (609)292-8390

Contact(s): Howard J. Shelton

Description of Products

(1) "ROAD MAPS" A curriculum activity guide for migrant students for grades K-6.

(2) "ROAD MAPS" A curriculum activity guide for migrant students in grades 7-12.

(3) The News Bulletin; a news letter

(4) MAP-S (Model Appraisal Process-Secondary); a brochure.

Dissemination Information

(1) The project involved the Migrant Education Program in Arizona, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Illinois and The District of Columbia.

The major objective of Project MAP-S (Model Appraisal Process-Secondary) for Migrant Career Awareness and Exploration was to implement, on an interstate basis, a model of career information and appraisal for high school-age migrant youths in school or who left school without graduating. The project identified students with the potential for benefiting from postsecondary education and provided them additional career exploration opportunities.

The project involved four major populations:

— Validated migrant students in grades seven through twelve, including a target group and a comparison group;

— The parents of those migrant students selected for participation;

— The individuals in area industry and commerce, business, and the professions;

— Individuals in public schools (at select sites in Arizona, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Washington, DC, and Illinois), public libraries, and the community-at-large.

The students selected for the project participated in a process which began with a pre-appraisal to assess their level of career awareness, understanding, knowledge and attitudes toward careers and occupations. The self-explanatory process of assessment was pursued through multi-media.

(2) Training was conducted at sites in each of the participating states. Additionally, presentations were made at the Eastern Stream Migrant Education Conference in Greensboro, North Carolina, and the National Migrant Education Conference in Portland, Oregon.

Project Title: Bilingual Teacher Training Program for Personnel Working with Limited English Proficient Migrant Youth

Funding Years: 1981, 1982

Grantee: New York State Department of Education

Address: Mid-Hudson Migrant Education Center
P. O. Box 250
New Paltz, NY 12561

Telephone: (914)257-2185

Contacts: Margaret Taylor, Project Director
Ilse Pitts, Project Coordinator

Description of Products

*(1) Language Development Activities booklet, 81 pages. Designed by the Bilingual Teacher Training Institute, summer 1982. Six color-coded sections of activities. Sections include:

- — Vocabulary: people, colors, numbers, etc.
- — Following Directions
- — Descriptive Words: feelings, opposites
- — Grammatic Structure: postive statements, verbs, plurals
- — Articulation: blends and digraphs, consonants
- — Verbal Expression: phone conversation, identification of objects/people, story

For each activity in a section, the objective is listed along with materials needed, preparation, and a graphic illustration.

(2) A video tape of the English as a Second Language component of the training was made. (Other training components included special education, English reading, Spanish reading).

Dissemination Information:

(1) This project was not designed to produce a product. It's purpose was to hold a summer training institute. The training was held in summer 1982 for three weeks, participants met daily from 8 a.m.-7 p.m.. The Language Development Activities booklet described above was a

compilation of some of the activities developed at the institute. All 42 participants received a copy of the booklet.

(2) Each participant was given a video tape to use for in-service training in their home states. Participants also received a packet of materials to use when giving an in-service workshop that included the necessary handouts, overhead transparencies, and notecards.

Project Title: CAPR/CAPM (Computer Assisted Program in Reading/in Math)

Funding Years: 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986

Grantee: New York State Department of Education

Address: State University of New York
Cortland, NY

Telephone: (607)753-4706

Contact: Patricia Sherman, Project Coordinator

Description of Products

(1) 1982: three workshops were held to train 90 educators in the use of CAPR/CAPM. These educators in turn trained 10-20 individuals in their respective states.

A questionnaire was mailed to all state directors in December to assess the difference between general and migrant education computer assisted instruction needs, 32 of the 51 directors responded.

(2) 1983: four survey forms were developed and distributed to determine the level and availability of computer technology in state and local areas. The surveys were targeted to these audiences: state directors, state migrant staff, nonmigrant state staff, teachers.

Presentations about the project were made as follows:

- AZ: Western Stream conference 2/16/83
- NC: Eastern Stream conference 3/24/83
- OR: National conference 5/5/83

12 micro computer instructional materials were developed by consultants and graduate assistants:

- B to B (math)
- Tutorial (test development)
- Word Dump (test and vocabulary development)
- The Right Word (comprehension)
- The Amazing Comma
- The And Game
- Keeper (record keeping)
- CAIM Handler (writing)
- The Right Connection (conjunctions)
- Asteriods (math)

(3) In the last year of the project, it became part of the MSRTS system. Migrant teachers have received information on how to use the system.

(4) The reading and math skills are currently being revised into nationally utilized skills.

Dissemination Information:

(1) State directors have received numerous brochures, newsletters and questionnaires over the course of the project.

(2) Workshops have been given at the Eastern and Western Stream conferences.

(3) The following states have received on-site workshops: KS, NY, PA, WA.

(4) In 1983, 500 teachers from 10 states were provided an introduction to computer education.

**Project Title:** Challenging Options in Career Education (CHOICE)

**Funding Years:** 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985

**Grantee:** New York State Department of Education

**Address:** State University of New York at New Paltz
Mid-Hudson Migrant Education Center
P.O. Box 250
New Paltz, NY 12561

**Telephone:** (914)257-2185

**Contact(s):** Margaret Taylor, Project Director
Ilse Pitts, Project Coordinator

**Description of Products**

*(1) Brochure: "Overview of CHOICE Curriculum Materials."

*(2) "Occupational Resources." For junior and senior high school students; English and Spanish versions; three reading levels (3rd and 5th grades, high school); 290 pp. Provides information about 60 occupations from 15 different work clusters.

(3) "Career Notes." For junior and senior high school students; English and Spanish versions; three reading levels. A job skills workbook. Includes information and activities on: self-awareness, work readiness, forms and applications, employment agencies, career clusters, resume writing, preparation for interviews.

(4) "Mission: Information." For junior and senior high school students; English and Spanish versions. A handbook for employee interviews, shadowing experiences, work experiences.

(5) Basic materials (7 levels for grades K-6). Content: job and role awareness; decision making/goal attainment; self-awareness. Materials include:

- Activity folders (nonconsumable)
- Learner log (consumable)
- Teacher log/guide (nonconsumable)
- Pre/Post-Assessments (consumable)

*(6) "Tool and Match Program", 5 personal computer diskettes that supplement and reinforce the existing information developed by the project. Titles of the diskettes: arts & humanities; health & safety; hospitality & recreation; agribusiness; 2/3 health & safety.

A 12 page manual for each diskette includes the following information:

- introduction
- hardware requirements
- making back-up copies
- learning objectives
- use: tutorial or classroom setting
- how the program works
- teacher sound option

Dissemination

(1) Available to states, at cost. Also available through ERIC/CRESS and Pennsylvania's MERLIN project.

(2) Project also provides training as requested.

(3) The five computer diskettes were disseminated to states participating for the first time in FY 1984-85, and to all continuing cooperating states. Training and technical assistance were provided to the cooperating states on how to use the disks.

Project Title: Eastern Stream Child Abuse Prevention and Education (ESCAPE)

Funding Years: 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985

Grantee: New York State Department of Education

Address: Cornell University
Dept. of Human Development and Family Studies
Family Life Development Center
G-21 MVR Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853

Telephone: (607)256-7794

Contact(s): Dr. Oscar W. Larson III, Project Director

Description of Products

*(1) "Preventing Child Abuse in the Harvest: A Handbook for Migrant Educators," 1985. Editor, Rebekah Dorman. Blue looseleaf binder, 125 pp. Content:

— Introduction

— Taking Action: role of the migrant educator; reporting child abuse and neglect; recognizing child maltreatment; classroom response to the maltreated child; prevention programs in school and community.

— Overview: historical perspective; causes and effects of maltreatment; the migrant family and child maltreatment.

— Appendices: outline of model child abuse and neglect policy for schools; New York tutorial outreach programs.

*(2) "A Resource Directory for Migrant Educators on Preventing Child Abuse and Neglect." Includes sections on state resources; child protective services; national committee for prevention of child abuse chapters.

(3) Workshops, 1983-84:

— "Structured workshop on child abuse and neglect for migrant education directors." Presented twice on Dec. 4, 1983 at NASDME meeting.

— "Child abuse and neglect: the migrant educator's perspective."

Feb. 27, 1984: 41 participants
April 30, 1984: 36 participants
May 3, 1984: 135 participants
May 8, 10, 1984: 70 participants
June 19, 1984: 30 participants
June 27, 1984: 60 participants
August 21, 1984: 50 participants

*(4) "Migrant Child Maltreatment in Florida: A Study of Incidence and Patterns", August 1986, 22 pages. The investigation was performed as one of the primary objectives of the 1983-84 ESCAPE project's plan for that year. The study was requested by Florida's Director of Migrant Education. The report provides:

- a summary of findings
- describes research methods
- research results (with graphs and charts)
- discussion
- footnotes
- references
- appendix a: sample design and characteristics
- appendix b: inferential procedures

Dissemination Information

(1) One copy of the "Handbook" and the "Resource Directory" sent to the over 450 migrant educators and parents attending ESCAPE workshops during the project year (1983-84).

(2) 50 copies of each publication sent to each of the six cooperating states.

(3) One copy of each publication sent to the remaining 44 states.

(4) Additional copies available at cost.

(5) In March 1985, project director estimated that ESCAPE had reached over 1,000 migrant educators representing every state in the nation; close to 500 of these, representing 34 states, had attended workshops on child abuse and neglect.

Project Title: Interstate Migrant Secondary Services Program (IMSSP)

Funding Years: 1981, 1982, 1983, 1984

Grantee: New York State Department of Education

Address: State University of New York at Oneonta
Bugbee School
Oneonta, NY 13820

Telephone: (607)432-0781

Contact(s): Ed Griesmer, Project Director
Robert Levy, Project Coordinator

Description of Products

*(1) "Program Manual," a national directory of secondary programs, services, personnel, schedules, etc. Two white looseleaf binders. Each listing includes type of service; name, location, and telephone number of provider; contact person; program dates; program description. Content:

- Academic services: career development; extended day/evening classes; in-school evening classes; in-school summer classes pre-registration/enrollment; tutorials; work experience; other.
- Alternative education services (for credit): alternative programs; learning activity packages; secondary credit exchange program.
- Supportive services: advocacy; career development; counseling; enrichment; work experiences; other (primarily medical).
- State profiles: page for each state with synopsis of services and subservices available.

*(2) "Junior High Migrant Student Services: A Compendium." May 1985, 25 pp. Provides an analysis of MSRTS enrollment by grade and age; reviews results of field contacts with junior high migrant students, their parents and teachers; summarizes the outcomes of workshops conducted during 1984 and 1985; presents strategies for migrant educators to consider in meeting needs of migrant junior high students.

*(3) "A Directory of Scholarships and Financial Assistance Programs Available to Migrant High School Graduates." June 1985, 22 pp. Scholarship categories include:

- Disadvantaged
- Federal
- Mexican American
- Migrant
- Minority
- Miscellaneous

*(4) "Directory of California Migrant Secondary Schools and Contact People," 1982. Yellow spiral binder, 60 pp. Lists school districts and their mailing addresses, superintendent, high school principal, counselor, home visitor. Includes map of California broken into migrant regions with regional director's name, address, phone number.

(5) "California Summer Migrant Programs Directory," 1982. Yellow spiral binder, 29 pp. Lists programs by region and city. Includes name of school district, specific school, grades served, dates, and contact person. Maps included.

(6) "Florida Directory of Area and District Migrant Administrators, Superintendents, Principals and Counselors," 1985. 80 pp.

(7) "Directory of Secondary Summer Migrant Programs," 1985. 17 states included. For each program, lists name and address of school district, director's name and phone number, opening and closing dates, whether or not transportation and food are available, and miscellaneous comments regarding subjects offered and class hours.

(8) "High School Equivalency Program (HEP) and College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP): Program Descriptions and Directory," 1985-86. Descriptors include: project location(s), contact person and phone number, program description, special or unique services, recruitment area.

(9) IMSSP Newsletter. Quarterly publication.

(10) Junior and senior high school transfer and secondary credit exchange forms.

(11) Brochure: Steps To Success. Available in English and Spanish. An information pamphlet for high school students, including check lists to use when enrolling or withdrawing from a school.

(12) Survey and response analysis of over 700 HEP students regarding reasons for dropping out of school.

Dissemination Information

(1) 1981-82: Field offices established in Florida and California. In cooperation with the Education Commission of the States, identified and disseminated state and local minimum competency and high school graduation requirements for the 50 states.

(2) 1982-83: Distributed directories of migrant summer programs and of key personnel in California and Florida to all the states. Distributed enrollment and secondary credit exchange/follow-up forms nationally. Sponsored exchange visits among home and receiving state educators in all three major migrant streams. Provided technical assistance as requested and made 13 formal presentations.

(3) 1983-84: Updated and distributed Florida Directory, Secondary Summer Programs directory. Distributed "Educational options. . ." describing promising programs for secondary students. Disseminated three issues of newsletter. Technical assistance provided to eight states.

(4) 1984-85: Distributed publication on junior high services to the 50 states. On-site contacts with 45 LEAS in six states plus 2 additional SEAs. Conducted training sessions and workshops in several states, reaching at least 900 participants. Distributed over 1,600 copies of each of three issues of newsletter; 60 Parent Advisory Councils included in mailing list. Sponsored limited number of interstate visits.

**Project Title:** Migrant Educators' National Training Outreach (MENTOR)

**Funding Years:** 1985, 1986

**Grantee:** New York State Department of Education

**Address:** Potsdam College of the State University of New York
Potsdam, NY 13676-2294

**Telephone:** (315)267-2504

**Contact(s):** Ken Lawless, Curriculum Specialist
Dr. William Q. Davis

## Description of Products

*(1) "Harvesting the Harvesters." Undergraduate-level correspondence course for migrant educators. Ten booklets and ten 30-minute audio tapes on five cassettes surveying the main themes of migrant education.

### Books

- "American Nomads: Notes on the Nature of and Needs of America's Migrant Children"
- "Educating the Uprooted: A National Commitment"
- "A Migrant Educator's Resource Kit: Where to Find the Help You Need"
- "The Family Support System: Education in its Broadest Context"
- "Class Acts: Instructional Strategies and Classroom Materials That Work"
- "Reading: The only Real R"
- "Letters, Numbers and other Symbols: Basic Skills in Writing and Math"
- "Neediest of the Needy: Special Education for Migrants"
- "Dream into Reality: Career Education in a Changing Economy"
- "Cooling Down the Melting Pot: Bilingualism and Multiculturalism"

### Tapes

- Pastures of Plenty/Will the Wolf Survive?
- Educating a Parade/The Family Matters
- A Brief Musical Interlude/Reshaping the Classroom
- Reading/Writing and Arithmetic
- A Job of Work/ Make All Kinds Wonderful

(2) "Migrant Education and Multiculturalism," a graduate-level course, uses the same materials as a base.

Dissemination Information

(1) In October 1986, approximately 90 people from 9 states were enrolled in the Mentor "College in a Box" program. Tuition for nonresidents of New York is over $300. Full-tuition scholarships and other types of financial aid are available.

**Project Title:** Migrant Evaluation National Pilot Study

**Funding Years:** 1985, 1986

**Grantee:** New York State Department of Education

**Address:** Bugbee School
State University of New York
Oneonta, New York 13820

**Telephone:** (607)432-0783

**Contacts:** Ed Griesmer, Project Director
Fred Johnson, Project Coordinator

Description of Products

(1) Annotated bibliography that reviews previous evaluation studies of migrant students.

*(2) List of test data accessible from the Migrant Student Record Transfer System. October 1985, 12 pages.

(3) Report of the criteria for the National Evaluation Design.

*(4) Report: Status of Norm-Referenced Testing among migrant projects in the USA. Identifies by state the norm-reference tests used in reading and math, the grades in which the test is administered, whether the test(s) are administered at an empirical norm period, what out of level testing is planned (if any), whether the state administers criterion referenced tests, and if the state. Arkansas, Hawaii, and Wyoming provided no response to this survey. March 1986, 8 pages.

*(5) A description of the five program evaluation models used by states providing migrant programs. January 1986, 2 pages.

*(6) Description of tests for preschool to grade 3 on "Attitudes Toward School and School Adjustment". Provides a summary of the test, author, date of test, appropriate grade level, name and address of the publisher. April 1981, 14 pages.

*(7) Description of tests for grades 4-6 on "Attitudes Toward School and School Adjustment". Same information is provided as in (6). April 1981, 18 pages.

*(8) Description of tests for preschool to grade 3 on "Measures of Self-Concept". Same information is provided as in (6). March 1981, 16 pages.

*(9) Description of tests for grades 4-6 on "Measures of Self-Concept". Same information is provided as in (6). March 1981, 16 pages.

Dissemination Information

(1) The annotated bibliography (1), the survey of existing test information on MSRTS (2), the national evaluation design (3), and the list of norm-referenced tests (4) were distributed to the advisory committee states and all the migrant state directors.

(2) Presentations have been made on this project at the National Conference last April, at the Eastern Stream Conference, March 1986. An article has been written about the project in the publication, MEMO.

NoTE: This project was established to design a model for evaluation of the education program for migrant students in the US. Data has been sampled from MSRTS, an analysis of the data is in progress. Usable data from the sample will be matched with pretest scores from either spring 1984 or fall 1984. The evaluation design will be applied to determine the feasibility of the model's application. Differences in grade levels or inter/intra state students and differences for fall to spring versus spring to spring testing schedules will also be ascertained.

Project Title: National Migrant Special Education Center

Funding Years: 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986

Grantee: New York State Department of Education
(NOTE: From 1984 - 1986, Minnesota became the grantee/fiscal agent for this project.)

Address: State University of New York at Geneseo
College of Arts and Sciences
P.O. Box 70
Geneseo, NY 14454

Telephone: (716)245-5520

Contact(s): Barbara McCaffery, Project Director

Description of Products

*(1) "Implementing the IEP Concept: A Procedural Guide." Red, looseleaf notebook, 1982. 100 pp.

(2) "A Rainbow of Ideas for Special Children," 1982. 71 pp. individualized activities for 8 specific categories of handicapping conditions: hearing impaired, speech impaired, mentally retarded, emotionally disturbed, visually handicapped, orthopedically impaired, multi-handicapped, learning disabled.

Activities were correlated to specific MSRTS skills in reading, math, oral language, followed by the area, topic, subtopic and skill that the material relates to.

(3) "Opening Doors for Children with Special Needs." 59 pp. Activities, classified by grade level, for reading, math, language arts.

(4) "Extra Special Art Projects for Children with Special Needs, 1983." 40 pp.

(5) "Extra Special Projects for Children with Special Needs: Correlating Music to Content Area Subjects," 1983. 37 pp.

(6) "Extra Special Puppetry Projects for Children with Special Needs, 1983." 12 pp.

(7) "Extra Special Musical Instruments Projects for Children with Special Needs, 1983." 12 pp.

(8) "A Technical Assistance Resource Guide of Handicapped Materials, 1985." Includes names of 200 agencies

solicited for materials useful to educators of migrant handicapped children.

(9) "Literature and Creative Writing Strategies: A Curriculum Partnership in Educating Children with Special Needs," 198_. 92 pp.

(10) "A Rainbow of Creative Curriculum Pattern Activities," 198_. 227 pp.

(11) "Building Content Area Skills Through Music and Art," 198_. 32 pp.

(12) "Getting the Scoop on Making Headlines with Secondary Schools," 198_. 41 pp.

(13) "Who Says You Can't Teach Reading and Math Activities Through Music?" 198_. 44 pp.

(14) "Let the Music Play," 198_. 50 pp.

(15) Newsletters, published periodically, 1981-86. Focus on issues and activities related to migrant children with handicapping conditions.

(16) Other products:

- National Policy Workshop Packet
- Legislative Updates
- Research reports
- Surveys
- Progress reports

Dissemination Information

(1) In general, materials developed through this project were distributed to State Directors of Migrant Education.

(2) Curriculum resource and activity books described above distributed to migrant educators throughout the country during inservice training workshops conducted by staff of the project. Workshops reached migrant educators from 32 states. Project staff estimates that potentially over 50,000 students were served by the 9,000 educators who received training.

(3) During FY 1984-85:

— Nine in-service training sessions were conducted, 24 states sent representatives

— A newsletter was compiled, printed and disseminated to migrant and special education personnel

(4) According to a progress report up-date of 1/29/86, five new curriculum activity books were being designed and developed to be disseminated to educators at national, state, and regional training sessions. The activity books cover these areas: oral language, literature, creative writing, math, and reading.

Project: Step Beyond

Funding Years: 1981, 1985, 1986 (Note: in 1981 this was part of the seven component grant awarded to NY)

Grantee: New York State Department of Education

Address: State University of New York
P. O. Box 2000
Cortland, NY 13045

Telephone: (607)753-4706

Contact: Barbara Wyman, Project Coordinator

Description of Products

*(1) Step Beyond Manual: spiral bound, 70 pages. The manual is divided into four sections:

— Donation sources: lists the names and addresses of 197 publishers, provides 3 catagories of responses to requests for donations 'no response', 'does not donate', 'donations'. A sample letter to a publisher from Ms. Wyman explains the purpose of the Step Beyond project and asks for donations.

— Get Acquainted Activities

— Creating Activities

— Sample Activities

The activity sections are designed for use with various types of donated materials (books, magazines, etc.). The materials needed, procedure, and objective is listed for the activity. Twenty-four specific activities are described. The section on creating activities provides general guidelines, a tools and supplies list for ten types of learning activities: game boards, matching, classifying, sequencing, modified worksheets, self corrective hole punch, following directions, writing, creative writing, and oral language activities.

*(2) "Reading with your Child", 10 page handout describing how to select books for children, types of books younger and older children like to read, how to be a reading partner with your child, types of materials found in the home that can be used to make supplemental reading activities. A four page bibliotherapy list is also included with such

topics as anger, baths, daydreams, death, the dentist, divorce, honesty, imaginary friends, loneliness, moving, school transfer, and sharing. Book titles are listed with author and the appropriate age level for the child.

Dissemination Information

(1) A manual was sent to each state migrant program director. Each director also received a brochure about the Step Beyond program.

(2) A letter (similar to the sample letter in the manual) was sent out to the publishers listed. Ms. Wyman also listed locations in various participating states where a publisher could send the donated material.

(3) Materials donated are primarily mailed directly to the migrant families. By 1986, the project was averaging 2,500 mailings per month to the cooperating states of NY, ME, CT, RI, MA, NH, and VT.

(4) For some of the materials received, the project develops learning activities and includes them in their mailings.

(5) In 1986, the project gave various parent workshops to show the parents the materials that were available, to encourage the parents to read to their children. Parents were given copies of the "Reading with your Child" handout.

Project Title: Migrant Education Interstate Project to Provide Career-Based Educational and Support Services to Migrant Students

Funding Year: 1982

Grantee: Oregon Department of Education

Address: Northwest Regional Education Laboratory (NWREL) Portland, OR

Telephone: (503)248-6800

Contact: Andrea Hunter Baker, Project Coordinator

Description of Product:

EBCE (Experienced-Based Career Education) was developed in 1970 at NWREL. It was piloted outside of Oregon, operated and evaluated by NWREL. It uses the concept of career education for awareness. NWREL received a subcontract from the Oregon SEA to implement EBCE for migrant students in Oregon, Washington, California, and Texas.

All EBCE activities are designed to meet a student's individual needs, abilities, learning styles and goals. EBCE strategies can be incorporated in a variety of ways into a school's existing curriculum. The success of the program depends on the school's commitment to the role education plays in preparing youth for employment, and a willingness to be flexible in offering and awarding academic credit.

(1) Each of the four states were visited by the project coordinator. The program was explained and discussions of a possible site for implementation were held. At the time of the project (FY 1982-83), neither Texas or Washington could find a site within their respective states for implementation.

The program was implemented at Woodburn High School, Woodburn, Oregon and at Fallbrook High School, Fallbrook, California.

Woodburn EBCE Project. Students in the program are both Hispanic and Russian 9th graders. They are enrolled for four class periods daily. They divide their time between job exploration sites in the community and the EBCE Center at the school. In addition to an elective credit, they receive credits in math, global studies, English and health.

Staff members in the Center teach the academic courses, provide English language tutoring and coordinate learning activities with the job exploration sites. The teachers are certified and have received five days of in-service training from EBCE developers at NWREL.

Fallbrook EBCE Project. Migrant students at this high school receive a similar educational opportunity as their peers in Woodburn. The school operates a half day program for 10th-12th grade students that is integrated with academic courses and English/ESL classes.

(2) EBCE has a five volume set of curriculum covering five areas: personal/social development, citizenship, science, critical thinking, and career development. The program is designed as a one or two year program for juniors and/or seniors in high school. It can be used as a fulltime alternative to the regular high school program.

The curriculum requires a strong commitment from the local community to implement. Competencies are 'certified and evaluated' by a member of the business community in the appropriate area. (Example: a student will learn in the classroom the necessary steps to open a bank account. The student then goes to a bank and must demonstrate the proper procedures for opening an account. Upon doing so, a bank employee will 'certify' that the student does possess the necessary skills to open an account.)

The program is designed to teach early employability skills, it is not a job skill training program.

Dissemination of Product:

(1) The Oregon and California EBCE projects for migrant students are still in operation today. The project sites received training and technical assistance from the NWREL coordinator. NWREL held joint meetings for the Oregon and California staffs to facilitate coordination between the two projects. In the post-grant period, NWREL picked up the cost for additional consultations.

(2) The September 1983 issue of the NWREL's newsletter Ideas for Action was dedicated to describing the Section 143 EBCE projects.

(3) A slide-tape show about EBCE was developed in 1984 by Andrea Baker and Susan Morse (Section 143 coordinator for the California Western Secondary Project). The slide-tape show is being disseminated across the country.

Project Title: Oregon Special Education Project

Funding Years: 1985, 1986

Grantee: Oregon Department of Education

Address: 700 Pringle Parkway SE
Salem, OR 97310-0290

Telephone: (503)373-1378

Contact: Gloria Muniz, Project Coordinator

Description of Product:

In 1985, the following three aspects of this project were subcontracted out. The project had a late start-up and a new director had to be hired.

(1) Database: two reports were developed in the form of literature searches on the number of migrant students who are also classified as needing special education services.

(2) Parent Training: done by COPE (Coalition of Parents Educating Parents). Two workshops were held for parents in summer 1986 (one in Marion County, one in Eastern Oregon). The workshops focused on helping parents understand their special education childs' IEP (individualized education plan). Another two-hour workshop was held May 12, 1986 in Marion County, 23 parents attended.

Staff Training: done by COPE dealt with understanding the terminology and processes of special education. Participants included home-school consultants, migrant and special educators (including administrators).

- May 7, 1986-Marion County, 12 participants, full day workshop.
- June 2, 1986-Marion County, 5 participants, full day workshop.
- June 9, 1986-Marion County, 8 pre-school teachers, full day workshop.
- August 21, 1986-Eastern Oregon, 7 participants, one from Idaho (cooperating state), one and a half day workshop.

(3) Direction Service Group (Marion County): home-school consultants got information to migrant families with special education children about the Group. Parents were served on a first-come basis. The Group worked very closely with the families, mediating at the school level, helping them negotiate funding for their children. Eight families were provided with this service.

Dissemination of Product:

(1) The project is attempting to continue the parent training aspect in FY 1986-87. Training is planned for home-school consultants in late August. Four regional conferences are planned for the end of the summer, early fall. The project anticipates 50 participants at each conference.

(2) There is a proposed assessment process that is being refined in order to implement the process in Oregon and Idaho. The process is modeled after one developed in Salem, Oregon that provides information on the migrant special education child from a multitude of sources. The process would include information about language acquisition, medical background, family information, culture, in addition to testing information.

**Project Title:** CARE-Community of Awareness and Resources Efforts

**Funding Year:** 1985

**Grantee:** Pennsylvania Department of Education

**Address:** 333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17108

**Telephone:** (717)783-7094

**Contact:** Lynn Berry, Project Coordinator

**Description of Product:**

(1) Handbook on developing partnerships with the private sector to benefit migrant youth, 22 pages, currently in draft form. The objective of the project is to provide awareness to migrant students of job other opportunities.

(2) Public relations brochure, 8 pages (in print).

**Dissemination of Product:**

(1) A state representative from each of the following states participated in the field testing (in Eastern MD) and training techniques of the project: DE, MD, NC, NJ, PA, VA; August 1986.

(2) A training session was held in California, December 1986 for representatives from CA (5), OR, WA, TX (2), FL, IL.

These seventeen people who were trained will be expected to provide staff development in their respective states on the use of the handbook in developing partnerships for migrant youth.

(3) When the materials return from the printer, they will be disseminated to all 50 state migrant offices.

(4) Presentations about the project were made at the Eastern Stream Conference-Tampa (3/86), National Conference-San Diego (4/86).

(5) The project received a write up in MEMO.

**Project Title:** Health Awareness Patterns Preventing Illness and Encouraging Responsibility (HAPPIER)

**Funding Years:** 1983, 1984, 1985

**Grantee:** Pennsylvania State Department of Education

**Address:** 333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17108

**Telephone:** 1-800-233-0306 or (717)783-7089
(Pennsylvania residents: 1-800-222-1936)

**Contact(s):** Julia Cortez, Project Manager

## Description of Products

*(1) HAPPIER Resource Guide, 2nd edition, August 1985. Two looseleaf binders containing sources of 1000 publications and audiovisual materials related to illness prevention and wellness promotion. English and Spanish language materials included. Format includes cost (free or nominal in most cases) and intended target population for each item described. Covers areas such as:

- nutrition
- disease control
- fitness
- mental health
- personal hygiene
- dental health
- preventive care

*(2) HAPPIER Resource Guide, 1st edition, September 1984. More limited edition of (1) above, containing about 600 items.

## Dissemination Information

(1) For the 2nd edition, one hard copy of the Resource Guide was sent to each consortium member, to each State Director of Migrant Education, and to the participating migrant health centers.

(2) All HAPPIER information is also available on diskette for general distribution. The toll free number listed at the top of this page may be used for specific information on specific topics as well as for ordering.

(3) During FY 1984-85, 22 workshops were given throughout the US and Puerto Rico: PA-5, CA-4, PR-4, WA-3, one each in AR, ID, IL, KS, NV, UT. Audiences included state and local migrant staff, teachers, teacher aides, nurses, doctors, and parents. No information on the number of total participants was found in the FY 1984-85 Performance Report of the project.

| | |
|---|---|
| Project Title: | MERLIN-Migrant Education Resource List and Information Network |
| Funding Years: | 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985, 1986 |
| Grantee: | Pennsylvania Department of Education |
| Address: | 333 Market Street<br>Harrisburg, PA 17108 |
| Telephone: | (800)233-0306, (717)783-5866 |
| Contact: | Gene Madira, Project Coordinator<br>(Jim Schaffer, former Coordinator) |

Description of Product

(1) Migrant Education Resource List: contains a series of 15 "scopes." (This is apparently similar to a broad descriptor in the ERIC system.) A scope is an area of interest concerning migrant education. Each scope has subtopics. The resource list provides migrant educators upon request, with the names of "experts" or experienced people within a scope as a reference for more information. Between 1982 and March 1986, the resource list data base had 375 names classified in 11 scopes. The scopes have been expanded to 15 and 1,000 names are currently classified into those scopes.

The scopes are: administration and supervision; career education; dropout prevention; education programs; ESL and bilingual education; health and human services; identification and recruitment of migrant students: MSRTS; parent and community involvement; special education; adult and vocational education. Legal assistance; housing; food banks; and private sector organizations working with migrants are the most recently added scopes. (MERLIN had previously been limited to public sector resource people. The large increase in resources to the data base has primarily come from the private sector listings.)

(2) Information Network: this aspect of MERLIN was almost nonexistent until March 1986. The project coordinator is working to obtain various materials from the "experts" in their area of experience, such as curriculum materials, articles, papers, etc.

Dissemination Information

(1) There is no charge to someone requesting a printout of information available under a scope. A toll-free number is

available. Until March 1986, the computer software was not able to merge the data in a scope. Thus, separate printouts had to be made for information on a scope for the SEA and LEA level. The software has since been updated.

(2) During FY 1985, 42 phone requests were made for information from MERLIN.

(3) When the project is over, all state directors will be given a notebook (or a computer disk) of the resource information list.

(4) Since March 1986, 764 letters have been mailed by the project coordinator to obtain information for the resource list scopes, 23 responses have been received. Most of the responses have been from the LEA rather than the SEA level.

(5) All Section 143 project directors from 1981-86 were contacted to cooperate with providing information to the data base. Fourteen responses have been received. The project coordinator cites the complicated form developed in the early years of the project as one obstacle in obtaining cooperation for requested information.

**Project Title:** Mr. Rogers Neighborhood-"Migrant Children Are Special"

**Funding Year:** 1985

**Grantee:** Pennsylvania Department of Education

**Address:** 333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17108

**Telephone:** (717)783-7094

**Contact:** Lynn Berry, Project Coordinator

Description of Product

(1) Three 15-minute videotape series featuring Mr. Fred Rogers. The videotapes were developed by Family Communications, Inc. (Pittsburgh) and address the area of self-esteem of young migrant children.

- "Mr. Rogers Talks with Migrant Children about Going to a New School"
- "Mr. Rogers Talks with Migrant Children about Speaking Different Languages"
- "Mr. Rogers Talks with Migrant Children about Saying Goodbye to Friends"

Accompanying print materials (in booklet form) were developed for classroom use with the tape series.

Dissemination Information

(1) Each of the 50 state migrant offices and the national Head Start office received one 3/4" master tape containing all three videos. This master tape can be used to make additional copies for LEAs or others who make requests in each state. In addition, each state received three 1/2" tapes, one video per tape. The states of CA, FL, and TX (the largest 'sending' states) received six 1/2" tapes. Each state received print materials for all tapes they were sent. There were 8,000 copies of the booklet were printed.

(2) The following presentations were made about the project:

- March 1986: Special Populations Conference in College Station, TX (the first tape was shown), 80 participants
- March 1986: Eastern Stream Conference, Tampa,

- April 1986: Michigan Migrant and Bilingual Conference, 20 participants

- April 1986: National Migrant Education Conference, San Diego, 150 participants

- November 1986: Texas Migrant Education Conference

The videos will have a premier presentation at the February 1987 Eastern Stream Conference in Philadelphia. A presentation is also scheduled for April 1987 at the National Migrant Conference in Minnesota.

(3) The project was one of ten gold medal winners in the International Film and Television Festival in New York City. The project also was featured in MEMO.

(4) Pennsylvania congressmen, senators, and the governor received a copy of the tapes and booklet.

**Project Title:** Teaching Environmental Awareness to the Children of the Harvest (TEACH)

**Funding Years:** 1982, 1983, 1984, 1985

**Grantee:** Pennsylvania State Department of Education

**Address:** 333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17108

**Telephone:** 1-800-233-0306 or (717)783-7089
(PA residents: 1-800-222-1936

**Contact(s):** Julia Cortez, Project Manager

## Description of Products

*(1) Curriculum packages for preschool through Grade 6, based on the theme that pesticides are dangerous: English and Spanish versions. Separate looseleaf binders for each level include:

- Curriculum units for teaching language arts and math (correlated with MSRTS Skills Information System).
- Teacher's guide and supplements
- Parent information booklet
- Visuals (16 pp.)

(2) TEACH Newspapers and Teacher's Guides, for junior high school students. English and Spanish versions.

(3) Curriculum unit for senior high school due to be completed in September 1986.

## Dissemination Information

(1) Copies of all the curriculum materials were sent to all State Directors of Migrant Education and Migrant Health Centers in late 1984, approximately 50,000.

(2) Junior high newspaper (200,000 copies) and senior high newspaper (100,000 copies) distributed to the states according to their number of migrant students. Teacher's guides (800 copies) were also distributed.

**Project Title:** Modality Education Project (MEP); later known as Learning Alternative Resource Center (LARC)

**Funding Years:** 1981, 1982

**Grantee:** Virginia State Department of Education

**Address:** P.O. Box 6-Q
Richmond, VA 23216

**Telephone:**

**Contact(s):** Lillian J. Strickland, Program Specialist
George Irby, Supervisor, Migrant Education

Description of Products

*(1) Overview of Modality Education Project. 40 pp. "Modality" refers to students' individual learning styles. MEP's principal activity is staff development. The overview describes the project's background, methodology, participants, management, programmatic aspects, and implementation process.

*(2) Two flyers describing MEP.

*(3) Newsletter: Modality Education Project. Issue I, Fall 1981; Issue II, Winter 1982. 8 pp.

*(4) Overview of Learning Alternatives Resource Center (LARC) Project. Describes project participants, goals, design and scope of services, implementation process, evaluation.

(5) Project planned to develop a minimum of 5 modality education instructional modules/curriculum packages.

Dissemination Information

(1) As of fall 1981, MEP had provided inservice training to 288 teachers from Virginia and Georgia and over 2,500 brochures and other program documents had been distributed.

(2) November 1981-January 1982: inservice training for 10 educators in the District of Columbia and 43 in New Jersey. 80 information packets distributed.

Project Title: Individualized Bilingual Instruction (IBI) Interstate Training Project

Funding Years: 1982, 1983

Grantee: Washington State

Address: Old Capitol Building
Olympia, WA 98504

Telephone: (206)753-1031

Contact: Louise Gustafson, Project Director

Description of Products

(1) This grant was used to implement the IBI program model in day care centers serving migrant children. The state of Washington had a subcontract with IBI. IBI staff trained day care paraprofessionals who had no previous training in how to deal with small children.

The IBI staff training program has 16 units, each unit focuses on a specific task related to class management. It takes 2-3 months to achieve competency in each unit. Trainees read the unit information in the manual, do role plays, have discussions with the trainers, and practice the skills with the children under supervision. To complete the 16 units requires about two years.

(2) The program also has a competency-based curriculum for the children in the day care centers. The curriculum is in English and Spanish. The components are:

- language development
- academics: pre-reading, pre-math, handwriting
- child choice activities: art, table games, toys, manipulatives

A token economy system is used with younger children for rewards, a contract system is stressed with older children.

Dissemination Information

(1) The project was funded for two of the three requested years. Presentations on IBI were made at Washington day care centers serving migrant children. The Washington State Migrant Council helped implement IBI throughout the state. IBI staff training was also held in Texas and

Indiana. (Indiana was a cooperating state only the first year.)

(2) Washington continues to fund the IBI program state-wide. The Texas Migrant Council provides funds for the Texas program.

(3) A project level phone interview was conducted with the director of the Walawala Community Day Care Center. The director stated that during the year, all 30-32 staff members are required to receive the IBI training. This center serves 171 children.

(4) IBI is in the National Diffusion Network and is used in 100 sites across the U.S. and in Mexico.

# APPENDIX C

## Overviews of 19 Section 143 Interstate and Intrastate Coordination Projects

## Index of Overviews


CA: Gifted & Talented Migrant Education Service Center
CT: Migrant Youth Vocational Project
DC: Migrant Training Internship
GA: Interstate Career Education for Migrant Students
IN: MERIT (Migrant Education Recruitment Identification Task Force Project
ME: Pilot Project to Determine Feasibility of National Evaluation of Migrant Children
MD: Delaware-Maryland Interstate Training Project for Program Staff and Parents
MI: Title I Migrant Evaluation System (TIMES)
MI: Youth Employability Development Project
MN: Career Related Curriculum & Services for Migrant Students
NY: GRAPE (Grade Retention & Placement Evaluation)
NY: Interstate Health and Education Linkage
NY: Interstate National Football League Goals for Migrant Youth
NY: MAP (Migrant Attrition Project)
NY: Training Video for Parents of Migrant Special Education Kids
NY: Tutorial Outreach Program
VA: Migrant Program Staff Development Project on Modality Education
WI: Central Stream PASS/Mini-PASS Program
WI: Migrant Education Item Bank

**Project Title:** Gifted & Talented Migrant Education Service Center

**Funding Year:** 1982

**Grantee:** California

The state department of education, in cooperation with California State University, Fresno and Fresno Unified School District, planned to establish a three-year national demonstration project in the form of a Gifted and Talented Migrant Education Service Center. The center was to provide intrastate coordination of existing educational programs and services. It was the intent of the project developers that the service center provide direct services to districts, schools, and eligible pupils within an eight-county region in Central California.

The project was funded only for 1982. Criteria for defining and testing gifted and talented migrant students were developed. A handbook of curriculum ideas for teachers was also completed. The project continued to receive funding from the state. The Fresno Unified School District has expanded the gifted and talented curriculum guide to a 77 page spiral notebook.

**Project Title:** Migrant Youth Vocational Project

**Funding Years:** 1982, 1984

**Grantee:** Connecticut

This 1982 grant was planned as a three year project. Year One activities included data gathering, analysis, and synthesis of information. Four Connecticut school districts having the largest migrant populations would participate. The primary project purpose was to identify and develop a successful and replicable approach for effectively educating migrant high school youth and preparing them for satisfactory entry into the work force.

After a one year hiatus, the 1984 grant proposed to assist the state's migrant youth in pursuing a meaningful school career and gaining successful employment. The program was designed to link youth with available programs and other resources. The core of the program would be a network of paraprofessionals—Migrant Vocation Resource Specialists—who would act as advocates for the students and program personnel.

**Project Title:** Migrant Training Internship **Funding Year:** 1981

**Grantee:** District of Columbia

This intrastate project planned to use vocational aptitude tests to determine career site placement in local businesses, hospitals, etc. for 25 secondary school students. A parent orientation session was held in order to reinforce the career education process. Post-tests were planned for evaluation purposes.

Based on information obtained in a phone interview with the project director, it is unclear whether the aptitude tests or the post-tests were administered.

**Project Title:** Interstate Career Education for Migrant Students **Funding Year:** 1981

**Grantee:** Georgia

This project involved a four-state consortium. Planned activities included an interstate teacher exchange, development of a flow pattern of the migrant students involved that would permit the effective deployment of resources, and a follow-up study to assess the success of the study and its potential for replication.

**Project Title:** MERIT (Migrant Education Recruitment Identification Task Force Project **Funding Years:** 1981, 1982, 1983

**Grantee:** Indiana

First funded in 1981, this project planned to organize a nine-state consortium to produce an identification and recruitment form acceptable to all states and a modular training handbook for recruiters.

In 1982, one proposed major activity was the ITS (Implementing the System) Project—a pilot destination notification system. The system was designed to locate students in a "destination" state who do not show subsequent identifications in that or another state. A second undertaking was CREST (Comprehensive Recruiter Effectiveness Skills Training) modular training system. Pilot training was to take place in twenty sites around the country. The project also planned to operate a recruitment resource center containing materials produced by migrant education programs in other states.

The 1983 project planned to identify and design effective interstate/intrastate training strategies for migrant education in

the southeast and the northwest U.S.. Activities included technical assistance to SEAs and LEAs in staff development and implementation of service delivery strategies.

**Project Title:** Pilot Project to Determine Feasibility of National Evaluation of Migrant Children

**Funding Year:** 1981

**Grantee:** Maine

The purpose of this project was to examine the kind and variety of tests administered to migrant children as they move from state to state. The project intended to identify no more than six tests among the 300 currently employed that were appropriately normed for migrant students. This project was not completed due to state administrative problems.

**Project Title:** Delaware-Maryland Interstate Training Project for Program Staff and Parents

**Funding Year:** 1981

**Grantee:** Maryland

The two states planned to design and develop four in-service workshops—three workshops for parents, one for migrant staff. The focus was to be the improvement of intergroup relationships and cultural understandings. Emphasis was also to be directed at the development of curriculum and teaching strategies to assist parents and teachers to respond more effectively to the needs of migrant children.

Parent training and staff seminars were conducted. A manual for parents was developed. The project received a 90-day no cost extension.

**Project Title:** Youth Employability Development Project

**Funding Year:** 1982

**Grantee:** Michigan

The general purpose of this project was to develop and implement strategies, instruments, and procedures for assisting migrant students in the transition from school to work. This project was not completed due to internal staff problems. Most of the money was returned to the federal government. [Information on this and the

following project was obtained from the new state director and a former project staff person.]

**Project Title:** Title I Migrant Evaluation System (TIMES) **Funding Year:** 1982

**Grantee:** Michigan

The project intended to develop and implement strategies and procedures for uniform testing and evaluation of migrant students in six states. The project encountered personnel problems including a state hiring freeze and three changes of directors which resulted in difference of opinions on activities to be carried out and a six month delay in start-up.

Completed project activities were: (1) partnerships with companies in Michigan as a foundation for migrant student employment links and purchase and remodeling of several old school buses into classrooms. The buses travelled to migrant camps to provide educational programs to migrant students. The state has continued this activity with state funds. A farmers cooperative was also formed to provide water and electricity to various migrant camps.

**Project Title:** Career Related Curriculum & Services for Migrant Students **Funding Year:** 1982

**Grantee:** Minnesota

The primary purposes of this intrastate project were to (1) make available appropriate career development learning experiences to K-12 migrant students and (2) develop interagency cooperation and coordination as a strategy for effectively delivering career related services.

**Project Title:** GRAPE (Grade Retention & Placement Evaluation **Funding Year:** 1986

**Grantee:** New York

The project involving New York and Florida is designed to study the age and grade level distribution of migrant children to determine the number of children who are one or more years below grade level for their age. The project intends to analyze the impact of grade retention and its causes, hold a series of "awareness" workshops with school administrators, and recommend solutions to the problem.

**Project Title:** Interstate Health and Education Linkage **Funding Year:** 1981

**Grantee:** New York

This project planned to make New York's health education/health delivery program available and accessible as a model for other states.

**Project Title:** Interstate National Football League Goals for Migrant Youth **Funding Year:** 1981

**Grantee:** New York

NFL players from the Buffalo Bills, NY Jets and the NY Giants worked with and acted as role models to migrant children to help those children formulate and realize intermediate and long-range goals for learning and living. This project has been institutionalized in several areas of the country with NFL and AFL teams.

**Project Title:** MAP (Migrant Attrition Project) **Funding Year:** 1986

**Grantee:** New York

The purpose of MAP is to conduct research to determine (1) the dropout rate of currently migrant students and (2) the grades in which attrition occurs most frequently. Approximately 1,000 students who were initially in grade 7 during school year 1980-81 are being tracked to determine their most recent scholastic status: dropped out, graduated, or still in school. MSRTS records serve as the principal data base.

**Project Title:** Training Video for Parents of Migrant Special Education Students **Funding Year:** 1986

**Grantee:** New York

This project intends to address the unmet national needs of (1) timely identification of migrant youth having handicapping conditions and (2) the student's placement into appropriate education programs. Video cassettes and accompanying training manuals will be designed, reviewed, and field tested by an intrastate advisory committee. Migrant parents will be provided the necessary information to understand their child's handicapping condition, to identify and

locate appropriate services, and to communicate with a service provider.

**Project Title:** Tutorial Outreach Program **Funding Year:** 1981

**Grantee:** New York

Consultants and resources were to be made available to other states interested in exploring the Tutorial Outreach approach, previously developed as a strategy to teaching migrant children.

**Project Title:** Migrant Program Staff Development Project on Modality Education **Funding Years:** 1981, 1982

**Grantee:** Virginia

In 1981 the project planned to design and construct a staff development model that focused on the learning modality style of the migrant child in the areas of early childhood, math, oral language and reading. The program was to be field tested in four cooperating states, with dissemination of the report and the staff development model to be sent to all states.

The 1982 project established a Learning Alternatives Resource Center (LARC) to provide on-going instructional support for teachers of migrant children. Eleven in-service modality education workshops were planned for teachers in the consortium states. Other planned activities included development of a minimum of 5 curriculum packages; technical assistance to cooperating states on an "as-needed" basis.

**Project Title:** Central Stream PASS/ Mini-PASS Program **Funding Year:** 1986

**Grantee:** Wisconsin

The project is designed to facilitate the administration of education programs in meeting the needs of middle and high school migrant students. Semi-independent courses are to be developed to allow students to work at their own pace and earn full or partial academic credit for work completed. The courses will be developed in accordance with the curricula and graduation requirements mandated by Texas, the home base for most Central Stream students.

**Project Title:** Migrant Education Item Bank **Funding Year:** 1981

**Grantee:** Wisconsin

This project's objective was to design and develop a computerized bank of testing items that could be used to measure the achievement of a migrant child. The measurement would be done directly by a teacher to facilitate immediate remediation or instructional placement.

This project was not completed during its Section 143 funding year. State funds were provided to continue work that included some field testing. However, the item bank was never finalized.